

9th March 1953] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

the House to-day, and if we proceed to transact business according to our will, then we will be following a very wrong and unconstitutional procedure. Even ten days back, I referred the matter to the Assembly Secretariat and requested them to rectify this defect. They have not rectified it. Now that we have an opportunity to rectify the same, I appeal to the Hon. Speaker as well as to hon. Members to correct the mistake and proceed in a constitutional manner."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Chair has nothing to do with this matter. It is the Governor who summons the Legislature. I have already told the House that under Article 212, even if there was an alleged irregularity of procedure, the proceedings can continue."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"The Governor's Address is different from the ordinary proceedings of the House. Article 212 cannot, therefore, apply to this case. I do not question the procedure adopted here but I must point out that the Governor's Address does not form part of the proceedings of the House."

9-20
a.m.

MR. SPEAKER:—"There is no use of raising this point because the Chair has nothing to do with that."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I would like to raise another point. Rule 5 provides that the Governor's Address must be followed by a discussion on that."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Not immediately. The Constitution of India has since undergone a change in respect of this rule."

III.—PANEL OF CHAIRMEN.

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have to announce to the House that under rule 15 of the Madras Legislative Assembly Rules, I have nominated the following Panel of Chairmen for the third session:—

- (1) Srimathi Thamma Kotamma Reddi,
- (2) Sri R. V. Swaminathan,
- (3) Sri P. Thimma Reddy, and
- (4) Sri C. Kandasami."

IV.—GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION.

RATIFICATION OF AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE 81 OF THE CONSTITUTION
(COMPOSITION OF THE HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE).

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

'That this House ratifies the amendment of Article 81 of the Constitution proposed to be made by the Constitution (Second Amendment) Bill, 1952, as passed by the two Houses of Parliament.'

Hon. Members are aware that the representation in the House of the People is governed by Article 81 of the Constitution, so far as

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [9th March 1953]

Parts A and B States are concerned. Article 82 deals with representation for Part C States. With regard to Article 81, a slight difficulty has arisen and that is why the amending Bill has been brought forward. Article 81 (1) (a) says :

‘ Subject to the provision of clause (2) and of Articles 82 and 331, the House of the People shall consist of not more than five hundred members directly elected by the voters in the States.’

Article 331 deals with the nomination of members of the Anglo-Indian community to the House of the People, if there is no sufficient elected representation for the community in the House. Then, sub-clause (b) of Article 81 (1) says :

‘ For the purpose of sub-clause (a), the States shall be divided, grouped or formed into territorial constituencies and the number of members to be allotted to each such constituency shall be so determined as to ensure that there shall be not less than one member for every 750,000 of the population and not more than one member for every 500,000 of the population.’

There are two things here. One is the total number of seats fixed for the House of the People. The other is the scale of representation prescribed under sub-clause (b). For the purpose of the recent elections, the population was calculated on a certain basis determined in an order issued by the President, who has been authorized under the Constitution so to do. That will be in force for three years from the date of inauguration of the Constitution. In the year 1951 we had a census and we find now that there has been a considerable increase in population. The result is, if we try to work Article 81 (1) (b) of the Constitution, all sorts of administrative and practical difficulties are found likely to arise. That is why the Government of India have thought it necessary to have this Article amended. There were two courses open to them. One is to amend sub-clause (a) and the other is to amend sub-clause (b), that is, either to remove the restriction on the total number of members in the House of the People or to alter the scale of representation. On a consideration of the whole matter, the Government of India came to the conclusion that it would not be advisable to increase the number of members in the House of the People. Therefore, they sought to amend sub-clause (b). For this purpose, they brought forward a Bill before Parliament in July 1952. When it came up for discussion, the Government of India agreed that the Bill be circulated for eliciting public opinion. The Bill was accordingly circulated for eliciting public opinion. Then it again came up before the House of the People and this time, the House thought that it was necessary to refer the Bill to a Select Committee so that the matter might be examined in all its aspects. The Select Committee sat and made some changes in the Bill. The Report of the Select Committee was considered by the House of the People as also by the Council of States and the Bill was passed. Since this matter relates to the representation of the States, under Article 368, the Act has to be ratified by the Legislatures of not less than one-half of the Part A and Part B States. In this connexion, I would like to mention that the Bill had already been circulated, public opinion elicited and reported upon by a Select Committee. Further, what

9th March 1953] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

is before the House is only a Motion, and not a Bill, ratifying the Act passed by Parliament. If it is a Bill, I can understand a Motion for referring it to a Select Committee or for circulation for eliciting public opinion. My respectful submission is that the Bill was before the country for quite a long time, opinions have been elicited, and finally it was passed. Therefore, let us not spend much of our time on this. The amendment is to sub-clause (b) which seeks to delete the words 'not less than one member for every 750,000 of the population and' so that the amended sub-clause will read :

'For the purpose of sub-clause (a), the States shall be divided, grouped or formed into territorial constituencies and the number of members to be allotted to each such constituency shall be so determined as to ensure that there shall be not more than one member for every 500,000 of the population.'

There is now only one limit fixed and this is in consonance with the recommendations of the Select Committee. Therefore, the point for consideration by this House is this : whether to agree to the principle that with the increase in the population, we should increase the total number of members in the House of the People or to change the scale of representation prescribed in sub-clause (b).

9-30
a.m.

"My submission is, the amendment now proposed has been fully considered by the House of the People with which it is mainly concerned, and the members of the House of the People have come to the conclusion that it will not be wise or advisable to increase the strength of the House of the People but to stick to the number of 500 members and amend only sub-clause (b). As originally proposed in the Bill, the intention was to amend the maximum and the minimum limits by substituting the numbers 850,000 for 750,000 and 600,000 for 500,000. Ultimately the Select Committee thought that even if the maximum were to be raised to 850,000, with the progress we were making in increasing the population, it might become necessary later on to further amend the Constitution. Therefore, they thought of making this change once for all which would not necessitate further changes in the Constitution later on. The maximum limit of 750,000 was removed and they decided to keep only the lower limit of 500,000.

"After all, this amendment would not work to the disadvantage of any State as sub-clause (c) of clause 81 (1) provides :

'The ratio between the number of members allotted to each territorial constituency and the population of that constituency as ascertained at the last preceding census of which the relevant figures have been published shall, so far as practicable, be the same throughout the territory of India.'

"That being so, it will not be possible to exercise any sort of discrimination between territory and territory and make a constituency smaller in extent, in respect of population, and of number of Members. In addition to this provision the delimitation of constituencies has been left to a Commission. A Bill has already been passed to constitute this Commission and the Commission has been appointed. As hon. Members are aware, the Commission is composed of two Members of the rank of Supreme Court Judges and the Election Commissioner. That

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[9th March 1953]

Commission is quite an independent body, a high-powered body. Under these circumstances, it is not likely that any sort of discrimination will be exercised between territory and territory. In addition to all this, there is also this constitutional guarantee that the proportion of representation as far as practicable shall be the same throughout the territory of India. We need not, therefore, be apprehensive about this amendment on the ground that simply because we remove the maximum, in certain cases, it might go much beyond the limit. The amendment relates to the representation of the various States in the House of the People and we can very safely accept this Resolution. We are already having 75 members in the House of the People from this State. It is a good number. It is not likely to be reduced. (Interruption.) Yes, we have a good number of representatives there and I am more than satisfied. I am sure that by increasing the number of representatives in the House of the People from this State we are not going to be more effective there. I would therefore commend to the House the acceptance of this Resolution regarding the amendment of the Constitution in this respect."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Motion moved—

' That this House ratifies the amendment of Article 81 of the Constitution proposed to be made by the Constitution (Second Amendment) Bill, 1952, as passed by the two Houses of Parliament.'

"I think the House will sit till 1-30 p.m. to-day."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Till 2 o'clock, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Then I will put the main motion and the amendments to the vote of the House at 1-45 p.m. Hon. Members who have given notice of amendments to the motion may now move those amendments formally."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Are the amendments in order, Sir? This is only a Resolution, and the amendment seeking to refer this Resolution to a Select Committee does not seem to be in order."

MR. SPEAKER :—" They are only formal. They may not be pressed. Let the hon. Member Sri Gopalakrishnaiah move his amendment."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" Sir, I beg to move—

' That after the words " this House " the words " appoints a Select Committee to report the pros and cons " be inserted. ' "

SRI S. VEMAYYA :—" I second it."

SRI S. VEMAYYA :—" Sir, I beg to move—

' Add at the end the following :—

" after eliciting public opinion in the matter. ' "

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" I second it."

9th March 1953]

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ Sir, I beg to move the following amendments standing in my name—

(1) For the word “ ratifies ” substitute the words “ constitutes a Select Committee to go through and report to ratify ”.

(2) Insert the word “ While ” at the beginning, and add at the end the following :—

“ and recommends to the Government of India to amend this Article 81 so as not to amend at every time of Census.”

(3) Add at the end the following :—

“ In sub-clause (b) of clause (1) of the Article 81 of the Constitution of India, for the figures “ 750,000 ” the figures ‘ 850,000 ’ and for the figures ‘ 500,000 ’ the figures ‘ 650,000 ’ be substituted.” ”

SRI C. KANDASAMI :—“ I second the amendments.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Finance Minister while moving this motion said that this was after all a very small matter. It is a question affecting the scale of representation and it is not a small matter. In the Hon. Finance Minister’s concept of democracy, the scale of representation of the people of this country in the Parliament of the country may appear to be a very small matter. But we on this side of the House have a different conception of what democracy is. While answering the interruption of my hon. Friend Sri Venkateswarlu, the Hon. Finance Minister also said that he was more than satisfied with the quantum of representation given in the House of the People for this State, that is, 75 members, was more than sufficient. That is the way he looks at the problem.

“ We are now faced with this situation. The framers of the Constitution when they framed the Constitution and brought it into force in January 1950 took into consideration the likely increase in the population of the country between the years 1941 and 1951 and provided for it in Article 387. It is not as though they did not foresee this increase in population. According to that Article, the population was to be ascertained not in accordance with the census of 1941 but by the President of the Republic, that is, the President of the Republic would make a rough calculation with regard to the increase in population that is likely to have taken place between 1941 and the elections. On that basis the quantum of representation as well as the constituencies were determined for the elections that took place. Within about two or three years after the Constitution came into force and the elections took place we are faced with the situation where the Government have come forward to amend that Constitution. This is a matter affecting the question of representation of the people of the States in the Parliament of the country.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[9th March 1953]

“ Article 387 reads as follows :—

‘For the purposes of elections held under any of the provisions of this Constitution during a period of three years from the commencement of this Constitution, the population of India or of any part thereof may, notwithstanding anything in this Constitution, be determined in such manner as the President may by order direct, and different provisions may be made for different States and for different purposes by such order.’

“ It was under this Article that the population was actually ascertained and the elections were held. The population at that time was ascertained to be 347·34 million, that is, the President of the Republic in 1950 ascertained the population of the country to be about 347·34 million and seats were allotted and elections were held on that basis. To-day it is stated that the population has increased to about 357 million according to the census of 1951 and therefore an occasion has arisen for the amendment of the Constitution. Are there not other countries where also this question of population comes up again and again? How do they solve this problem? How does the United States of America, a country from which this Government gets inspiration from time to time, solve this problem? In the United States of America, the House of Representatives had 65 members when the Constitution came into force and to-day it has about 435 members for a population of about 140 million. In the United Kingdom which is smaller than ours and which has a population of about 50 million—about one-eighth of our population, the House of Commons has about 640 members to-day; the number has been increasing from time to time and to-day it stands at 640. In Ireland, a small country, the National Parliament has a representative for every 20,000 to 30,000 people. In the U.S.S.R., a country which has got a population which is half or less than half of that of our country, the Supreme Soviet has about 1,127 members. If all the countries of the world are able to give adequate representation to their people so that the members may be able to speak on behalf of the people, why should in this country alone the representation in the House of the People, whatever might be the population, be limited for all time to come permanently to 500 and why is this figure 500 sacrosanct?

(At this stage, the Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair.)

“ Sir, the representation in Parliament is not an ordinary matter. In the Parliament we deal with questions vitally affecting the people of this country and the Preamble to our Constitution says that the people of this country are sovereign. Now, when a member has got to keep in touch with about 750,000 people—obviously a constituency in which there will be about 450,000 voters—is it all possible for that member to keep himself in touch with the voters who have elected him? In which part of this world is it possible? The more we increase the number of voters, the more difficult will it become for the member to keep himself in touch with the voters. And the Parliament after it has been elected, will become absolutely unrepresentative of the people and the members will not be able to reflect the views and desires of the people. In the United Kingdom, the United States of America,

9th March 1953] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

the U.S.S.R. or France, the voters can approach their representatives and represent their grievances so that they can bring them to the notice of the Government either personally or through questions in the Parliament. In India where each member represents about 450,000 voters, how is it possible? They cannot keep themselves in touch with the people even by correspondence; it becomes an absolute impossibility. That is why, the greater the quantum of representation, the easier will it be for the members to keep themselves in touch with the mass of electorate. But our Government has got an entirely different concept of democracy. Perhaps they feel that, when once a Member gets elected, he can forget his electorate till the next elections. I would like to ask: Are they making a real democratic election? An ordinary peasant or worker can never hope to get elected. He cannot even stand for election. Only money-bags and millionaires can do it and not ordinary common people, if the number of voters is increased. Therefore I say that the increase in the number of voters and reducing the quantum of representation, would be restricting democracy. It is not in consonance with the spirit of the Constitution as proclaimed in the preamble. On the other hand, that preamble itself will become farcical. Therefore I would say that the number of representatives should be increased—and I don't say it should be an unwieldy figure of 2,000 or 3,000. While it has become possible in other countries, why should we not do the same thing? Are we of a different mould? Therefore, Sir, I oppose the motion before the House and support the amendments moved by my hon. Friend Mr. V. Gopalakrishnaiah and others."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ఉపాధ్యక్ష, ఇది చాలా ముఖ్యమైనటువంటి సవరణ. కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము రాజ్యాంగ చట్టాన్ని సవరిస్తూ ఒక బిల్లును ఆమోదిస్తు, దానిని శాసన సభ అమోదానికి పంపించింది. ఇటువంటి ముఖ్యమైన విషయములలో మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వము శాసనసభయొక్క అభిప్రాయమును తెలుసుకోకుండానే తమయొక్క అభిప్రాయాన్ని కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వమునకు ఇదివరకే తెలియజేసింది. అప్పుడే అనగా కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క అభిప్రాయమును కోరిన వెంటనే ఈ బిల్లును మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వము శాసన సభయందు పెట్టియుండిన చాలాకాగుండేది. శాసన సభ సమావేశము అయిన వెంటనే దీనిని ప్రవేశపెట్టి ఈ సభ ఉద్దేశము తెలుసుకొని కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి ఆ విధంగా తెలియజేసి ఉండవలసినది. అలా కాకుండా, మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వము ముందుగానే తమ అభిప్రాయాన్ని తెలియజేస్తూ ఈ బిల్లును బలపరచినది. అవిధముగా చేయడం ద్వారా, తమయొక్క పార్టీనిగూడా ఇందుకు Commit చేయిస్తున్నది ఇదిఒక గొప్ప తప్పిదమని భావిస్తున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వము, శాసన సభయొక్క ప్రతియొక్క అభిప్రాయాన్ని తెలుసుకొన్న తరువాతనే కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వమునకు తెలియజేయవలసినది, గాని ముందుగానే తమ ఆమోదాన్ని తెలియజేస్తూ, తమ పార్టీ కూడదన్ని ఆమోదించేటట్లు చేయడం సరియైన పద్ధతికాదు. మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వము ఈ బిల్లును బలపరచడంలో, వారిదృష్టి ఏ విధంగా ఉన్నరో, సుబ్రహ్మణ్యంగారు ఇంతకుముందు చేసిన ఉపన్యాసము చూస్తే వారు ఇదివరకు ఒక ప్రశ్నకు సమాధానమిచ్చినట్లు, కొద్దిమంది సభ్యులు ఎక్కువగా ఉన్నంతమాత్రాన మనయొక్క దృష్ట

[Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu] [9th March 1953]

భక్తు ఎక్కువ ఖచ్చితముగాను, ఎక్కువ effective గాను ఉంటుందనుటకు వీలులేదని అభిప్రాయపడుతున్నట్లు తెలుస్తున్నది. కాని, ఎక్కువమంది సభ్యులన్నట్లైతే, మన 'దృక్పథము' అభిప్రాయము ఎక్కువ ఖచ్చితముగా, స్పష్టంగా, effective గా ఉండగలదని నేను చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఇది వివాదాస్పదమైన అంగీకరించవలసిన విషయము. అట్లుగాక, విప్లవబాణ్యంగారో లేక రాజకీయాలాచారిగారో దీనిని బలపరచును, కేంద్రప్రభుత్వము దీనిని ఆమోదించినంతమాత్రాన దీనిని అంగీకరించవచ్చుననే దృష్టిలో తీసుకొనుట తప్పు. పార్లమెంటులో ఎక్కువమంది సభ్యులున్నప్పుడే వారు తమ యొక్క నియోజకవర్గములలోని సమస్యలన్నీ బాగుగా తెలుసుకొని ఆవిధంగా ప్రజల అభిప్రాయాలను ప్రతిబింబింప జేయడానికి వీలుంటుంది. అంతే కాకుండా, మరొక విషయాన్ని ఇందాకా మా పార్టీ నాయకులు శ్రీ రామమూర్తిగారు తెలియజేశారు. శాసన సభలో ఉన్న సభ్యులుగాని, పార్లమెంటులో ఉన్నటువంటి సభ్యులుగాని తమ నియోజకవర్గములలో tour చేసి ప్రచారము చేయవలసిన అవసరమున్నదనిగూడ వారు తెలియజేశారు. ఆవిధంగా చూచిన నియోజకవర్గములు పెద్దవిగా ఉన్నట్లైతే సభ్యులకు ఎంత కష్టముగా ఉంటుందో ఆలోచించవలసియున్నది. తమ నియోజకవర్గములలో విడు సమస్యలన్నాయి ప్రజల విషయము కొంటున్నారని అని సభ్యులు తెలుసుకోవలసిన అవసరమున్నదనే విషయాన్ని మరచిపోకూడదు. అటువంటిప్పుడు, నియోజకవర్గములు పెద్దవిగా ఉన్నట్లైతే, సభ్యులకు చాలా కష్టముగా ఉంటుందని చెప్పకతప్పదు. ఇప్పుడు శాసనసభనియోజకవర్గములు తీసుకొన్నప్పటికిని, సభ్యులు ఈ విషయములో ఎంతో కష్టపడవలసియున్నది. దీనికై ఎంతో కాలము ఖర్చుచేయవలసి వస్తున్నది. అటువంటిప్పుడు పార్లమెంటుసభ్యులు అయిదు సంవత్సరముల కాలములో ఒక తడవ అయినా తమ నియోజక వర్గములోని ప్రతి గ్రామానికి, లేక కొన్ని కొన్ని గ్రామాలకైనా వెళ్ళవలసియుంటే, ఎంత కష్టపడవలసియుంటుందో, ఇది సాధ్యమో, అసాధ్యమో ఆలోచించవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. అందువల్ల ఈ విషయాలన్నీ కూడ దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని, నియోజక వర్గాలను ఎక్కువ చేసి పార్లమెంటు సభ్యత్వ సంఖ్యను పెంచినచోగాని ఈ సమస్య సంస్కారముగాదు. కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము అయిదువందలకంటే ఎక్కువ పార్లమెంటు సభ్యుల సంఖ్యను పెంచడానికి నిరాకరిస్తున్నది. ఈ సందర్భములో ఇంకొకవిషయాన్ని ముఖ్యబాణ్యంగారి దృష్టికి తీసుకొనిరావలసి యున్నది. రాష్ట్రశాసన సభ్యులసంఖ్య విడు వందలవరకు ఉండవచ్చునని మన రాజ్యాంగములోనున్నది. పార్లమెంటు సభ్యత్వం విడు వందలకు మించుటకు వీలులేదని అన్నారు. అంటే, పార్లమెంటులో ఎంతసభ్యుల సంఖ్య ఉన్నదో, అదేవిధంగా రాష్ట్ర శాసన సభ్యుల సంఖ్య కూడ అంతవరకు limit చేయబడినది అనే విషయాన్ని మరచిపోకూడదు. ఇది రాజ్యాంగములో, ఒక బలహీనమైన అంశముగాను, తప్పుగాను తోచక తప్పదు. శాసనసభలో సభ్యత్వాన్ని విడు మూర్తవరకు పరిమితినివ్వడము, వోటర్లను పెంచడము జరుగుచున్నప్పుడు పార్లమెంటుకు ఈవిధంగా చేయడము అంటే, పార్లమెంటుకు అన్యాయము చేయడము తప్ప మరేమీకాదు. ప్రజలయొక్క కోరికలుగాని, సమస్యలుగాని ప్రజాసభలో ప్రతిబింబింపజేయవలెనంటే, ఎక్కువమంది సభ్యులు ఉండినప్పుడే ఇది సాధ్యమవుతుంది. ఈ సందర్భమున రామమూర్తిగారు ఇతర దేశాల ఉదాహరణల్ని గూడ తీసుకువచ్చారు. ఒక రష్యా అంటే చాలామందికి బహుశా ఇష్టముఉండవచ్చు, లేకపోవచ్చు. కాని చాలామంది కాంగ్రెస్ పార్టీ సభ్యులకు, కాంగ్రెస్ నాయకులకు అమెరికా, బ్రిటన్ అంటే చాలా అభిమానము. ఇది అందరికీ తెలిసిన విషయమే. అలాంటిప్పుడు ఆ దేశాలలో జరుగుచున్న పద్ధతులు ఆలోచించినప్పటికీ, అమెరికాలోను, బ్రిటన్ లోను,

9th March 1953] [Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu]

పార్లమెంటులో ఆయా ప్రతినిధుల సంఖ్య క్రమంగా పెరుగుతూవచ్చినది. అక్కడ ఐదు సూర్లకు, ఆరు సూర్లకు సభ్యత్వసంఖ్య మించకూడదని రాజ్యాంగములో లేదు. అటువంటిప్పుడు, భారత రాజ్యాంగములో మూత్రము ఈ విధంగా పార్లమెంటు సభ్యుల సంఖ్యను ఎందుకు ఐదు సూర్లకు పరిమితి చేస్తున్నారో అర్థం గావడంలేదు. ఇది సరియైన పద్ధతి కాదు. అందువల్ల ఈ బిల్లును మనము అన్ని పార్టీలవారుగూడ వ్యతిరేకించవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము పార్లమెంటు సభ్యుల సంఖ్య ఐదు సూర్లకు మించకూడదని చెప్పినప్పుడు సభ్యులు అక్కడ డెప్లీలో కూర్చొని ప్రజలతో వివిధ సంబంధములేకుండా, ప్రజలు ఈ విషయమై విమర్శించుకుంటున్నారో ప్రజలు ఇందుకు అంగీకరిస్తున్నారా లేదా అని విచారించకుండా ఆమోదించడం జరుగుచున్నదనే విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వము తెలుసుకోకపోతున్నది. కనుక, ఇక్కడ ఉక్తి టువంటి సభ్యులందరు గూడ, వారు ఏ పార్టీకి చెందిన వారైనప్పటికీ దీనిని వ్యతిరేకించవలసిందని విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నాను. తిరువాన్కూరు కొచ్చిన్ శాసన సభలో కూడా ఈ ప్రవర్తన ఆమోదించబడలేదు. ఈ సవరణను వారు వ్యతిరేకించారు. కాని ఇక్కడ దురదృష్టవశాత్తూ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యంగారు, రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు దీనిని ముందుగానే ఆమోదించడం, ఆ విధంగా కాంగ్రెసు పార్టీ సభ్యులందరు దీనిని ఆమోదించుటకు commit చేయించడం చాలా శోచనీయము. ఇది పార్టీకి సంబంధించిన విషయము కాదు. ఇది ప్రజలందరికీ సంబంధించినటువంటి సమస్య. కనుకనే తిరువాన్కూర్-కొచ్చిన్ లో కాంగ్రెస్ పార్టీగూడ దీనిని నిరాకరించింది. అదే విధంగా ఇక్కడ, మన శాసన సభలో కూడా కాంగ్రెసు పార్టీవారు అన్ని పార్టీలవారుగూడ ఈ బిల్లును వికగ్రీవముగా తమ నిరాకరణను తెలియజేయవలసిన అవసరమున్నది.

“ఈ సందర్భమున మరొక విషయాన్ని సుబ్రహ్మణ్యంగారి దృష్టికి తీసుకొని రావలసియన్నది. ఇప్పుడు మద్రాసు శాసనసభ విడిపోతున్నది. ఆంధ్ర శాసన సభ్యులు వేరే కూర్చోబోతున్నారు. అటువంటి ఈ సమయములో ఈ బిల్లును తీసుకొనిరావడం మంచిదిగాదు. ముఖ్యంగా ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రము వేరు కాబోయేటప్పుడు, దీనిని ఇప్పుడు ఆమోదించడమంటే, రాజోయ్యేటటువంటి ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్ర శాసన సభను కూడ దీనికి commit చేసినట్లు అవుతుందని సూచిస్తున్నాను. అందువల్ల, ప్రభుత్వము ఈ దృక్పథములోగూడ ఆలోచించి ఈ బిల్లును వెంటనే ఉపసంహరించుకోవాలనియు, ఈ బిల్లును ఆమోదించవలసిందని తమ పార్టీ మీద వొత్తిడి తీసుకొని రావడం ద్వారా కోరుతూ, సభ్యులందరుగూడ దీనిని వ్యతిరేకించవలసిందని విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తూ, నేను ఈ బిల్లును వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI N. GOPALA MENON :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this is a resolution which has been sponsored by the Government of India and I think it ought not to have any serious opposition. The Leader of the Opposition was telling us that in democratic institutions there ought to be large representation. He was telling us (at any rate he is not present here now) that the present House of Commons in England (Sri P. Ramamurthi : ‘ I am here ’) is having a strength of as many as 640 members whereas in our country which is much larger and ten times much bigger than England we are having only 500 persons as representatives of the entire country. It may look odd that when we are trying to have democratic institutions we are really trying to make the number of constituencies smaller; but Sir, the Leader of the Opposition

[Sri N. Gopala Menon]

[9th March 1953]

forgets that in England there are no State Assemblies similar to the ones we have in our country where we have larger representation and wherein all local matters could be thoroughly discussed. Therefore it is not necessary that in the Central Legislature there should be still greater representation. The present fixation of the strength of the House of the People at 500 is no doubt a big number. I do admit that in the United States of America, there are as many as 435 members in the House of Representatives. I also admit that in India which is sufficiently bigger than America the representation is smaller; but, Sir, in all these questions we have to consider side by side the degree of literacy in the respective countries and not concern ourselves only with the size of the population, and clamour that in India we must have a representative for every 25,000 of the population just as they have in England. I think in Burma they have provided for a single representative for every 30,000 of the population. Here in India we have one representative for every seven lakh and fifty thousand of the population. It is true that at the time of the elections it may not be possible for a candidate to go and approach each and every one of the seven lakh and fifty thousand people. But we have to remember that this seven lakh and fifty thousand is not the number of voters but the number of the population. Therefore it is not as if at the time of elections the candidate who stands for election has to go round and see all the seven lakh and fifty thousand people. He has to approach only the requisite number of voters in the population. The Constitution in this respect will have to be amended from time to time if the population is to grow. The present fixation of the strength of the Union House of the People at 500 cannot for long continue to be the same. As our people become more and more educated and as the overall percentage of literacy in the country increases, it would be necessary to restrict the constituencies further and give larger representation to the people. That I no doubt admit. But in the circumstances in which we are situated to-day, I do not think it advisable to amend the Constitution and that too only a few years after it has been inaugurated.

“ This amendment of the Constitution has already received the assent of several State Legislatures. I think it is a very reasonable amendment. I understand from the booklet that has been supplied to us containing the discussion on this subject in the Union House of the People, that the proposed amendment has also a reference to the accommodation available in the present House of the People. After all, Sir, this is only a small amendment and I think it ought to be approved by our House without much difficulty.”

10
a.m.

* **SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR** :—“ கனம் உதவிச் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே ! அரசியல் சட்டத்தைத் திருத்தும்படியான சட்டத்தை ஆதரிக்கும் பிரேரணையை நான் எதிர்க்கிறேன். காரணம் என்னவென்றால், ஏற்கெனவே ஜனத்தொகை மிக அதிகமாக இருந்தது. அதனால் அந்தந்தப் பிராந்தியத்தில் தேர்தலுக்கு நிற்பவர்கள் சுற்றுப்பிரயாணம் செய்து வேட்டாட்டங்களுடன் தொடர்பு கொள்வது மிகவும் சிரமமாக இருக்

9th March 1953] [Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar]

கிறது. தொகுதி மக்களுடன் அடிக்கடி தொடர்பு கொண்டு அந்தந்தத் தொகுதி மெம்பர்கள் அந்தந்தத் தொகுதியிலுள்ள ஜனங்களுக்குச் சேவை செய்வது மிகவும் சிரமமாக இருக்கிறது. ஆகையினால் அப்படிப்பட்ட கஷ்டம் இருந்து கொண்டிருக்கும் பொழுது இப்பொழுது வந்திருக்கிற திருத்தம் அந்தக் கஷ்டத்தை ஓரளவு அதிகப்படுத்தியே தவிர குறைப்பதற்கு உதவியாக இருக்காது, இதனால் மேலும் சில கஷ்டங்கள் ஏற்படும் என்பதற்காகத்தான் இதை நான் எதிர்க்கின்றேன். மேலும் பெரிய பணக் காரர்கள், செல்வந்தர்கள், நிலச்சுவாந்தாரர்கள்தான் இந்தத் தேர்தலில் நிற்பதற்கு வசதி ஏற்படுமே தவிர சாதாரண ஒரு தொழிலாளியோ, விவசாயியோ தேர்தலில் இந்தக்காலத்தில் பங்கு கொள்ளமுடியாமல் போய்விடும். குறிப்பாக எங்கள் ஜில்லாவில் கோயங்காலைப் போன்றவர்கள் தான் தேர்தலுக்கு நின்றார்கள். காரில் சென்று தேர்தல் பிரசாரம் அவர்கள் செய்ததோடு அல்ல. ஏரோபளேனில் பறந்து கொண்டே பிரசாரம் செய்தார்கள். ஆனால் அந்தப் பெரிய தொகுதியில் பிரசாரம் செய்வதற்கு அந்தத் தொகுதி மக்களுக்கு வசதியில்லாமல் போய்விட்டது. மேலும் தேர்தலுக்கு நிற்பவர்கள் 30 ஆயிரம் ரூபாய்க்கு மேல் செலவு செய்யக்கூடாது என்று விதி இருக்கும் பொழுது, ஒரு தொகுதியின் விஸ்தீர்ணத்தை அதிகரித்துக் கொண்டே போனால் அந்தப் பணத்திற்குள் எப்படி தேர்தலுக்குப் பிரசாரம் செய்ய முடியுமென்பதையும் நாம் கவனிக்க வேண்டும். அம்மாதிரி செய்ய முடியாது என்பதற்காகத் தான் நான் இதை எதிர்க்கின்றேனே தவிர வேறு எந்தக் காரணத்திற்காகவும் அல்ல. 500 அங்கத்தினர்களுக்கு மேல் அதிகமானால் ஏதேனும் இடையூறு ஏற்படுமென்றும், நிர்வாகத்தில் குந்தகம் ஏற்படுமென்றும் சொல்லுவதெல்லாம் மிகத் தவறு. ஏற்கெனவே சென்னை சட்டசபையில் இருந்த அங்கத்தினர்களை விட இப்பொழுது மிகவும் அதிகமாக இருக்கிறது. இதனால் என்ன நிர்வாகம் கெட்டுவிட்டது? எந்தக் காரியத்தைச் செய்ய முடியவில்லை என்று நான் கேட்கிறேன். அதனால் தான் பார்லமெண்டிலும் அங்கத்தினரின் எண்ணிக்கை அதிகமானால் அதனால் எந்தவிதமான நிர்வாகக் கெடுதலும் ஏற்படாது என்று நான் சுட்டிக்காட்ட விரும்புகிறேன்.

“எங்கள் ஜில்லாவில் உள்ள 24 லக்ஷம் ஜனத்தொகைக்கு 4 பார்லமெண்டு அங்கத்தினர்கள் இருக்க முடிந்தது. இப்பொழுது 7½ லக்ஷம் ஜனங்களுக்குமேல் போகாது என்று இருப்பதை நீக்கிவிட்டால் பின்னர் அது 9½ லக்ஷத்திற்குக் கூட கொண்டு போய்விடக்கூடும். எந்தந்த இடத்தில் சம்பந்தில் நடந்த தேர்தலில் காங்கிரஸ் தோற்றதோ அந்தந்த இடங்களில் லெல்லாம் இம்மாதிரி சாதாரண ஜனங்கள் தேர்தலில் போட்டி போட முடியாத வகையில் அதிகமான விஸ்தீர்ணத்தை நிர்ணயித்து விட வசதி ஆனும் சர்க்காருக்குக் கிடைக்கும். இத்தகைய காரணத்திற்காகத்தான் இந்த மாதிரியாகத் தீர்மானம் கொண்டுவரக்கூடாது என்பதாக நான் மத்திய சர்க்கார் செய்யவிரும்பும் திருத்தத்திற்கு ஆதரவு அளிக்கும் தீர்மானத்தைப் பலமாக எதிர்க்கிறேன்.”

SRI V. GOPALA GOUNDER :—“Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this resolution which has been moved by the Hon. Finance Minister recommends to this Honourable House the ratification of the amendment of Article 81 of the Constitution. I have read the amending Bill and the Statement of Objects and Reasons attached to it, and I have also heard the speech of the Hon. the Finance Minister. I feel myself—and I say it is my party's view also—that there is nothing serious in making this ratification. This amendment is probably intended to remove certain legal difficulties that are likely to crop up at a later stage, say, every ten years, i.e., after every census. The amendment, as stands, is not likely to do any harm either to the electorate or to the candidate now sitting in either House of Parliament or to those who are sitting here.

[Sri V. Gopala Gounder] [9th March 1953]

This amendment is only in respect of Article 81. So far as this House is concerned, any amendment relating to it should be under Article 170 (2). In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, I find there is reference made to 'readjustment of the representation in the House of the People and in the State Legislative Assemblies'; but I do not know how far it is correct. Anyhow we are now asked to consider only the amendment relating to Article 81.

"The main objection, from what I heard in the speeches of my hon. friends, seems to be that this is undemocratic. They say that when an electorate is enlarged, it is impossible for the candidate or the representative to move about the whole area, keep contact with the people and know their aspirations and their needs and try to help them through the Legislature. That, I think, cannot be a valid objection, because the territorial constituencies themselves are not changed by this amendment; the only result will be that the candidate or the representative will represent instead of $7\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs, $8\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs or so. And that cannot be a ground for saying that it will be impossible for the candidate or the representative to be in touch with the electorate and know their needs and aspirations. The other objection that is raised is that instead of enlarging the constituencies, the ceiling number of 500 for the House of the People can be raised. That argument was met by other speeches which I read from the book supplied to me, on the ground that if the ceiling number of 500 was raised, the House of the People would become unwieldy and unworkable. The British Parliament has been cited as an example to show that although the area is very small, there is a representative for every 75,000 people and there are 640 members in the British Parliament. And on that basis, it was asked why the strength of the House of the People here should not be increased to 600 or 700. Sir, there are various factors which will have to be taken into consideration, since the conditions in Great Britain and India are very different. Anyway, considering all the advantages and the disadvantages of increasing the ceiling number and also enlarging the territorial constituencies for the House of the People, I think it is in the interests of one and all to see that the present strength of 500 is maintained. There will be no harm caused to the representative or the candidate if the territorial constituencies are increased as proposed. I feel that this amendment is after all only a formal amendment which is to be ratified by this House, as it is intended only to remove the defects that are likely to arise at a later stage. I therefore submit that I myself and my party are of opinion that this amendment to the Constitution may be ratified by this Assembly."

* SRI M. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—“ఉపాధ్యక్ష, రాజ్యాంగ చట్టమును సవరించుటకుగాను తెచ్చిన ఈ బిల్లునాన్ని నేను వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నాను. ఈ సవరణ చాలా ప్రమాదభరితమైనటువంటిది. దేశంయొక్క వైశాల్యాన్ని, జనాభాను గుర్తించక ఏవో కొన్ని స్వల్ప కారణాలను దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని మాత్రమే ఈ సవరణ చేయబడినట్లు తోస్తోంది. మన దేశం సువిశాలమైన దేశం. దాదాపు 36 లక్షలు

9th March 1953]

[Sri M. Venkatasubba Reddi]

జనాభా ౫౦ దేశం. ఇంత పెద్ద దేశానికి 500 మంది ప్రతినిధులు మాత్రమే చాలానని కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వంవారు తలచడం విచారకరమైన విషయం. ఈ సవరణ చాలా అసందర్భంగా ఉన్నది. ఇప్పుడున్న ప్రాతినిధ్యం చాలా స్వల్పం. ఇతర దేశములలో పోల్చి చూచుకున్నట్లయితే ఈ విషయం బాధపడుతుంది. United Kingdom వంటి చిన్న దేశంలో 640 స్థానాలు ఉన్నాయి. ఆ దేశంలో 25 వేల ప్రజలకు ఒక ప్రతినిధి చొప్పున ఉన్నాడు. Ireland దేశంలో కూడా 30 వేల మందికి ఒక ప్రతినిధి చొప్పున ఉన్నాడు. మన పొరుగున ఉన్న బర్మా దేశంలో 30 వేల మందికి తక్కువలేకుండా, లక్షకు ఎక్కువ లేకుండా నియోజకవర్గాలను ఏర్పాటుచేశారు. ఇతర దేశాలలో ప్రజాప్రాతినిధ్యం ఈ విధంగా ఉంటుంటే మన దేశంలో 36 కోట్ల జనాభాకు 500 మంది ప్రతినిధులను మాత్రమే ఏర్పాటు చేయాలనడం చాలా పొరపాటునా ఆగ్నిచాయం. నియోజకవర్గాలను పెద్దవిగా చేసినందువల్ల ధనవంతులు మాత్రమే ఎన్నికలకు నిలబడి ప్రమాదం ఉంది. సామాన్యులు ఎన్నికలలో పాల్గొనే అవకాశం లేకుండాపోయింది. ధనవంతులకు భద్రత కలుగజేయడం, రాజ్యాధి కారాన్ని జమీందార్లకు, భూస్వాములకు మాత్రమే గుర్తగా ఇవ్వడం ముఖ్య విధానాలుగా ఉన్న కాంగ్రెసువారు ఇంతకన్న వేరు విధంగా చేస్తారని ఆశించడంకూడా పొరపాటునా సరిపెట్టింది. సభ్యుల సంఖ్యను కనక పెంచినట్లయితే హెచ్చు ధనవ్యయజూతుండని తలచి ప్రజాప్రతినిధుల సంఖ్య పరిమితం చేయవలసిన కాంగ్రెసువారు కోట్లాది మొత్తం జమీందార్లకు నష్టపరిహారమివ్వడం శోచనీయమైన విషయం. నష్టపరిహార మివ్వనిదే జమీందారీలను రద్దు చేయుటకు ఏలులేదని ఒక వైపు రాజ్యాంగ చట్టములో ధనవంతుల భద్రతలను పోషిస్తూ మరో వైపు నియోజకవర్గాలను విస్తృతం చేయుటం మూలాన డబ్బు విశరీతంగా వెచ్చించగలిగిన ధనవంతుల ఎన్నికలలో నెగ్గలిగే అవకాశం కల్పించడమే కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వ విధానంగా వెల్లడవుతున్నది. మన దేశం పేద దేశం, హెచ్చుమంది ప్రతినిధులున్నచో వారి జీత భత్యాలకు ఎక్కువ ఖర్చు అవుతుంది, పార్లమెంటు భవనాన్ని పెద్దదిగా నిర్మించవలసి వస్తుంది. ఇంత ధనవ్యయం మనం భరించలేము. కనక మన పార్లమెంటుకు 500 మంది సభ్యులు మాత్రమే చాలు అని వాదించడం అసందర్భంగా ఉన్నది. సభ్యులకు ఈ నాడు ఇస్తున్న జీత భత్యాలు తగ్గించివేయవలసిఉంది. పేద ప్రజానీకానికి ప్రాతినిధ్యం వహించే ప్రతినిధులు I class లో ప్రయణం చేయవలసిన ఆగత్యం ఎంతమాత్రంలేదు. ఈ నాటివర 1½ I class లు ఉన్న సర్కరలేదు. అదే విధంగా మంత్రుల జీత భత్యాలను కూడా తగ్గించవచ్చు. తదానా వచ్చే మిగులు సొమ్ములో ఇతర సభ్యుల నిమిత్తం, భవన నిర్మాణాల నిమిత్తం అయ్యే ఖర్చులను సరిపెట్టుకోవచ్చు. అంతేనీకాని ప్రజాప్రాతినిధ్యాన్ని పరిమితం చేస్తాము అనడం న్యాయంకాదు. నియోజకవర్గం పెద్దది కావడంవల్ల ఎన్నికలలో ప్రచారానికి చాలా కష్టమవుతుంది. ఎంతో డబ్బు ఖర్చు చేసే శక్తి ఉన్న వాళ్లుగాని ఎన్నికలలో నిలబడడానికి వీలుండదు. ప్రజా సామాన్యంలో సన్నిహిత సంబంధం ఉన్నవారికి కాక హెచ్చు డబ్బు ఖర్చుచేయగల వారికే ఎన్నికలలో పాల్గొనే అవకాశం కలుగుతుంది. తత్ఫలితంగా పెట్టుబడిదారులు, జమీందార్లు, భూస్వాములు మాత్రమే ప్రజాప్రతినిధులై కూర్చుంటారు. ఈ ప్రమాదాన్ని గుర్తించవలసినదని ప్రభుత్వంవారిని కోరుతున్నాను. అంతేకాక నియోజకవర్గం పెద్దది అయినట్లయితే ప్రజాప్రతినిధులు ప్రజలలో సన్నిహిత సంబంధం పెట్టుకోవడం కష్టం. తమకు ఎన్నుకొనినవారి కష్ట సుఖాలు తెలుసుకొని వారి ఇబ్బందులను తొలగించడానికి ప్రయత్నించడానికి ప్రజాప్రతినిధులకు అవకాశంలేకుండాపోతుంది. ప్రజాప్రాతినిధ్యాన్ని సాధ్యమై

10-10
a.m.

[Sri M. Venkatasubba Reddi] [9th March 1953]

సంతకము పెంపుచేసినందువల్లనే ప్రజాస్వామ్యము సుకరమౌతుందిగాని, దాన్ని కుదించి
 నందువల్ల ప్రజాభిప్రాయం అణగ వేయబడుతుందని ప్రభుత్వంవారు గుర్తించగోర్రాను.
 ధనాభావాన్ని సాకుగా తీసుకొని ప్రజా ప్రతినిధుల సంఖ్యను 500 కు పరిమితం
 చేయడం అసమంజసమైన విషయం ప్రజాస్వామ్య నిర్వహణకు కావలసిన యంత్రాంగం
 ప్రజాసామాన్యానికి బాధాకరంగా ఉండరాదనే దానిలో నేను అంగీకరిస్తాను. ఈ
 భారాన్ని తగ్గించడానికి ప్రయత్నించేయడం మంచిదే, అయితే ప్రజాప్రతినిధులు
 సంఖ్య తగ్గించి వేస్తాము. అంతా మేము అంగీకరించు ఈ నాడు సభ్యుల నిమిత్తం
 అయ్యే ఖర్చును తగ్గించండి. మొదటి తరగతి బర్లాలు అపివేయండి వేద ప్రజలతో బాటు,
 వారి ప్రతినిధులు కూడా మూడవ తరగతిలో ప్రయాణం చేసినందువల్ల వచ్చే చిక్కెమీ
 లేదు. ఈ విషయంలో శ్రీ గోపరాజు గామవంధ రావుగారు ఒక ఉద్యమాన్ని
 నడుపడలమన్నారు. ఆర్థిక సహనత్వం ఉండాలని ఒక వంక చెబుతూ, ప్రజా
 ప్రతినిధులు మొదటి తరగతిలో ప్రయాణం చేయడం ఎంతమాత్రం సమర్థనీయంకాదు.
 సామాన్య ప్రజలు ప్రయాణించే మూడవ తరగతిలోనే ప్రజాప్రతినిధుల ప్రయాణం
 చేసినట్లయితే ప్రజల ఇబ్బందులేమా తెలుసుకొనుటకు వారికి ఎక్కువ అవకాశ
 ముంటుంది. ఈ విధంగా చేయడంవల్ల ప్రజాస్వామ్య నిర్వహణ యంత్రాన్ని సాధ్యమై
 సంత విశాలంగాను, భారం కానటువంటిదిగాను చేయవచ్చును. కాబట్టి ఈ రాజ్యాంగ
 వట్టు సవరణ తీర్మానాన్ని ఉపసంహరించుకొనవలసినదని నేను కోరుతున్నాను. తక్కువ
 ఖర్చులో ఎక్కువమంది సభ్యులను విస్తృతమైనందువల్ల ప్రజాస్వామ్యం సుకరం
 కాగలదు. ప్రజాభిప్రాయాన్ని సమగ్రంగా తెలుసుకొనుటకు కూడా అవకాశం
 విస్తృతమౌతుంది. కాని ఈ సవరణను ఆమోదించినట్లయితే ప్రజాప్రతినిధ్యం తగ్గి
 పోతుందని, సరియైన ప్రజాప్రతినిధులు ఎన్నుకొనుట కష్టమని కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వం
 వారికి హామ్యరిక చేస్తూ ఈ సవరణ తీర్మానాన్ని వ్యతిరేకిస్తూ ఇంటితో విర
 మిస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI K. VARADACHARI :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the
 question before the House is a very simple one—it has become
 simple. The matter has been discussed threadbare in both the
 Houses of Parliament. The necessity for this amendment of the
 Constitution and the *pros* and *cons* of the proposed amendment
 have been well put by all the sections of the Houses of Parliament
 and the amendments which were proposed by the Opposition were
 later not moved at all. But, though there was a division of the
 House of the People on the amendment to clauses 1 and 2 of the
 Bill which was then discussed, the question whether we are
 proceeding in a democratic manner, or restricting the operation
 of democracy in our country, by the proposed amendment
 does not arise in this case at all, because this is only an
 incidental matter to the main provision in the Constitution,
 namely, that the House of the People shall consist of not more
 than 500 representatives. As incidental to that proposition laid
 down there once for all, the question of distributing this represen-
 tation over the population of this country had to be decided in the
 Constitution and they had to fix two things under the Constitution,
 namely, that the President shall ascertain and fix the population of
 the country and the representation according to that population
 shall operate between a minimum of five hundred thousand and
 a maximum of seven hundred and fifty thousand people. Within

9th March 1953]

[Sri K. Varadachari]

these two limits he had to fix the operation of this representation according to the population then known. Now, our population is said to have increased by about 13 per cent and the representation has therefore to be adjusted simply to the population and therefore this amendment has become necessary. The question whether we should not enlarge the number fixed already under the Constitution for the House of the People is a different question altogether and is not germane to the subject-matter now under consideration and which was also considered and passed by the Houses of Parliament. Therefore, I submit, that so long as the provision, namely, the maximum number of 500, has been fixed under the Constitution, until there is public opinion enough in this country, so as to enable Parliament to increase the number”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ May I just interrupt the hon. Member and point out to him that it is open to the Parliament to amend either clause 1 (a) or 1 (b) and may I also point out to him that we are not just rubber stamps and it is not necessary just to ratify it simply because the Parliament has passed that Bill.”

* SRI K. VARADACHARI :—“ The hon. Gentleman has misunderstood me. What I am submitting is that, until the Parliament is compelled to amend Article 81 (1) (a) which prescribes an over-all limit of 500 members for the House of the People by public opinion expressed either through the State Legislatures or otherwise we cannot oppose this amendment. So long as that Article is there in the Constitution, we are bound to adjust the representation of the several territorial constituencies in the House of the People according to the figures of population available upon the completion of each census, which is held once in ten years. To be revising the representation in the House of the People with reference to the prescribed limit of 500 members is a very inconvenient and troublesome arrangement. The inconvenience is there and I do not deny it.”

10-20
a.m.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ The constitutional position as it stands to-day is this. The provision prescribing a limit of 500 members in the House of the People and also the provision prescribing that there shall be not less than one member for every 750,000 of the population and not more than one member for every 500,000 of the population are there. If, as a result of the increase in population, we find that both these provisions are not compatible, the question for us to consider is which of these two provisions has got to be altered. It is open to us to recommend the alteration of either the one or the other. If this House refuses to ratify the amendment proposed for the latter of the two provisions referred to above, then the Parliament is indirectly compelled to change the former provision.”

* SRI K. VARADACHARI :—“ With due deference to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, I must say that he is begging the question. My submission is that so long as Article

[Sri K. Varadachari]

[9th March 1953]

81 (1) (a), which prescribes a limit of 500 elected members in the House of the People, is there, we have got to adjust the representation in the House of the People on the basis of the population as ascertained at each census. It is not as if we are undemocratic in our outlook or anything of that sort if we accept this amendment. After all, the Article prescribing a limit of 500 members was passed by the representatives of the people of this country. Public opinion should assert itself as to whether it wants to enhance the limit of 500 members prescribed for the House of the People. The people have got the right to suggest that the limit should be increased to 1,000 or even 2,000. But that point is not germane to the motion before the House, though we may express our view in that matter. So long as the limit of 500 members in the House of the People is there, it is futile to oppose this motion."

* SRI P. JEEVANANDAM :—“ கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த திருத்தத்தை ஆதரிப்பதற்கு நிற்கிறேன். அப்பொழுது இரண்டொரு கருத்துக்களைச் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். இந்த திருத்தத்தை எதிர்த்துப் பேசுவதற்கு முன்னால், சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலிருந்து வைத்த கருத்துக்களை ஆட்சேபிக்குப்போது சில கருத்துக்களைக் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. ஒன்று இந்தியாவில் இன்றைக்கு அமுலில் இருக்கக்கூடிய அரசியல் சட்டத்திற்கு பிறப்பிடம் என்று கருதப்படுகின்ற பிரிட்டன், அமெரிக்கா போன்ற நாடுகளின் ஜனநாயக அரசியல் அமைப்புகளை எடுத்துப்பார்த்தால் அங்கு ஜனநாயகம் வளரும்போது அதற்குத் தகுந்தபடியாக பிரதிநிதி எண்ணிக்கையை பார்வையிடும்போது அதிகரித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அதைக் கூறும்போது பிரிட்டனை எடுத்துக் கொண்டு சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலிருந்து கனம் கோபால் மேனன் அவர்கள் கூறினபடி பிரிட்டனில் நம்முடைய நாட்டைப்போன்ற ராஜ்ய சர்க்கார் கிடையாது என்று ஆட்சேபிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. வாஸ்தவம்தான், பிரிட்டனில் ராஜ்ய சர்க்கார் இல்லை தான். ஆனால் பிரிட்டனில் இருக்கக்கூடிய ஐந்து கோடி ஜனத் தொகைக்கு 640 பிரதிநிதிகள் இருக்கின்றார்கள். இந்த 640 பிரதிநிதிகளுக்கும் பிரிட்டனில் சகல பிரச்சனைகளையும் விவாதித்து முடிவு கட்ட சகல அதிகாரங்களும் உண்டு. நமது ராஜ்ய சர்க்காரில் இருக்கக் கூடிய பிரதிநிதி களுக்கு அந்த மாதிரியான உரிமை இல்லை என்பது கனம் மெம்பர் அவர்களுக்கு தெரியுமோ தெரியாதோ? தெரியும் என்றே நான் நினைக்கிறேன். இங்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய ராஜ்ய சர்க்காருக்கு என்ன அதிகாரம் இருக்கிறது என்றால் போலீஸைக் கொண்டு ஆட்சி நடத்தக் கூடியதான அதிகாரம் தான் இருக்கிறது என்பதை கனம் கோபால் மேனன் அவர்களுக்கு எடுத்துச் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். பிரிட்டனிலுள்ள பரோ கவுன்சிலுக்கு இருக்கக் கூடிய அதிகாரம் கூட நமக்கு இங்கு கிடையாது. நமக்கு வர்த்தகத்தில் உரிமை உண்டா. கைத்தொழிலில் உரிமை உண்டா, சங்கம், அந்நிய நாட்டு விவகாரம் தேர்தல் முதலியவைகளில் உரிமை இருக்கிறதா? எந்த வகையில் நமக்கு இங்கு உரிமை இருக்கிறது. வாக்காளர்கள் நமக்கு பிரதிநிதித்துவம் அளித்திருக்கிறார்கள். அந்த அம்சங்களில் நமக்கு என்ன உரிமை இருக்கிறது என்பதை யோசித்துப் பார்க்க வேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக் கொள்கிறேன். இப்பொழுது நாட்டில் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் பஞ்சத்தைத் தடுப்பதற்கு நமக்கு உரிமை இருக்கிறதா? அதிகாரம் இருக்கிறதா? குண்டாந்தடிக்கொண்டு பஞ்சப் பிரதேசத்தை அடக்கியாலும் அதிகாரம்தான் நமக்கு இருக்கிறது. வேறு அம்சங்களில் நமக்கு அதிகாரம் இல்லை என்பதை கனம் அங்கத்தினர்கள் பார்க்கவில்லை என்பதை இந்த சபையின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வருகிறேன்.

“ அடுத்தபடியாக அமெரிக்காவை எடுத்துக் கொண்டால் அங்கே 435 அங்கத்தினர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அங்குள்ள ஜனத்தொகை எட்டு கோடி.

9th March 1953] [Sri P. Jeevanandam]

நம்முடைய நாட்டில் 500 பேர்கள் பிரதிநிதிகள் இரந்தால் போதும் என்று பார்லிமெண்டில் சொல்வது சரியல்ல. எட்டு கோடி மக்களுக்கு 435 பிரதிநிதிகள் இருக்கும்போது 35 கோடி மக்கள் இருக்கும் நம்முடைய நாட்டிற்கு எவ்வளவு பிரதிநிதிகள் வேண்டும் என்பதைப் பார்க்க வேண்டும். யுனெடெட் ஸ்டேட்சில் 435 அங்கத்தினர்கள் இருக்கும்போது இங்கு எவ்வளவு வேண்டும் என்பதையும் கனம் கோபால் மேனன் போன்ற சர்க்கார் தரப்பு அங்கத்தினர்களுடைய கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன்.”

SRI N. GOPALA MENON :—“ How many are there in Russia? ”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ There are 1,127 members.”

SRI P. JEEVANANDAM :—“ அங்கே 16 குடியரசுகள் சோவியத் யூனியனிலுள்ள அங்கத்தினர்களுக்கு இந்த மாதிரியான அதிகாரம் இல்லை. அவர்களுக்கு அரசியலில் பூரண அதிகாரம் இருக்கிறது. சுப்ரீம் சோவியத் யூனியனில் 1127 அங்கத்தினர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள், என்பதை அவருடைய கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வருகிறேன். நாம் குறிப்பாக பிரிட்டனை எடுத்துக் கொண்டாலும் சரி அல்லது எந்த ஜனநாயக தேசத்தை எடுத்துக்கொண்டாலும் சரி அங்கே ஜனத்தொகைக்கு தக்கவாறு முக்கியமாக சட்டசபையிலும் பார்லிமெண்டிலும் அங்கம்வகிக்கிறார்கள். அந்தவிதமாகவே இங்கும் நம்தேசத்திலும் அமைக்க வேண்டும். ஆனால் மற்றொரு ஆட்சேபணையை கனம் கோபால் மேனன் கிளப்புகிறார் அங்கெல்லாம் படித்தவர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள் என்று. இந்த ஜனநாயக அரசாட்சியில் படிக்காதவர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள் என்றால் அது யாருடைய தவறு. அரசியல் சட்ட பிரகாரம் வயது வந்தவர்களுக்குக் கெல்லாம் வேண்டுமென்று அவர்களுடைய வோட்டுகளை வாங்கிக் கொண்டு இங்கு வந்திருக்கிறோம். படிக்காதவர்களுடைய வோட்டுகளை பெரும்பான்மையாக வாங்கிக் கொண்டு வந்துதான் இங்கு பிரதிநிதிகளை உட்கார்ந்து கொண்டிருக்கிறோம். அப்படியானால் நாமெல்லாம் படிக்காத முட்டான்களுடைய பிரதிநிதிகள்தானே. நம் எல்லோருக்கும் படிக்காதவர்கள்தான் வோட்டுப் போட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். படிக்காதவர்கள் அதிகமாக இருக்கும் நாட்டில் அவர்களுடைய பிரதிநிதிகள் அதிகமாக இருக்கவேண்டும். அதுதான் ஜனநாயகத்திற்கு Consistent ஆக இருக்கும் என்பதை கனம் அங்கத்தினருக்கு தெரிவித்தக் கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன். வயது வந்தவர்களுக்கு எப்படி முக்கியமாக வோட்டுரிமை அளிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறதோ அதைப் போலவே ஜனத்தொகைக்குத் தக்கவாறு பிரதிநிதிகள் அமைக்க வேண்டும் என்பதை வலியுறுத்த விரும்புகிறேன். பன்னிப் பன்னி சொல்லவேண்டியதில்லை. மக்களுக்கு மேலும் மேலும் பிரதிநிதிகள் பெருக வேண்டும். முக்கியமான அம்சங்களில் படித்தவர்களின் பிரதிநிதிகளின் எண்ணிக்கை கொஞ்சம் இருந்தால் போதும் என்று கூட சொல்லலாம். ஆனால் படிக்காதவர்களின் பிரதிநிதிகளின் எண்ணிக்கை தான் அதிகமாக இருக்கவேண்டும். நம் நாட்டில் இன்னும் படிக்காதவர்கள் அதிகம் இருக்கிறார்கள் என்றால் அது யாருடைய தவறு. ஜனநாயக ஆட்சி வந்து 6 வருஷம் ஆனபிறகும் கூட பெரும்பாலோர்க்கு கல்வி கொடுக்க முடியவில்லை. இதை மறுக்கக் கூடாது ஆகவே முக்கியமாக ஒன்றை குறிப்பிட விரும்புகிறேன். எதிர் தரப்பிலிருந்து நல்ல கருத்துக்களைக் கொண்டு வந்தால் அதை அங்கீகரித்து வந்தால் தான் ஜனநாயகம் வளரும். அது இல்லாமல் எதிர் தரப்பில் கொண்டு வருவதற்கு வார்த்தைக்கு வார்த்தை சிங்காரம் என்று, பதிலுக்கு பதில் எதையாவது சொன்னால் ஜனநாயகம் வளராது. இந்த மனப்பான்மை கூடாது. அது ஜனநாயக சபைக்கு உகந்தது அல்ல என்பதை கூறிக்கொண்டு, 500 பேர்கள் தான் இருக்கவேண்டும் என்பதை ஒத்துக்கொள்ளக் கூடாது என்பதை சொல்லிக் கொண்டு கனம் வாவிலாலா கொண்டு வந்த திருத்தத்தை ஆதரிக்கிறேன்.”

10-30
a.m.

* SRI K. V. RAMASWAMY :—“உதவிசபா நாயகர் அவர்களே ! கனம் அலிலாலா கோபால சிருஷ்ணய்யா கொண்டு வந்த தீர்மானத்தை நான் தரிக்கிறேன். அரசியல் சட்டத்திற்கு கொண்டு வரப்பட்டுள்ள இந்த நடுத்தலில் விவாதம் நடைபெறும் இந்த சமயத்தில் எனக்கு சில கஷ்டங்கள் நினைவுக்கு வருகின்றன. பொதுத் தேர்தல் நடைபெறுவதற்குமுன் பல கூட்டங்களில் பண்டித நேரு பேசினார். அப்பொழுதல்லாமல் இந்திய அரசியல் சட்டத்தில் 192-ஆவது ஆர்டிகளுக்கு திருத்தம் கொண்டுவந்தாக வேண்டும் என்று முடிந்திருந்தது. நீலச் சீர்திருத்தத்தை முடிவுக்கு கொண்டு வந்து விவசாயிகளுக்கு வாழ்வளிக்க அந்த ஷரத்துடன் கட்டையாக இருக்கிறது. நிலப் பிரபுக்கள், ஜமீன்தார் ஆகியோரின் வலங்களை நஷ்ட ஈடு இன்றி எடுத்துக் கொள்வதற்கு அது குறுக்கே வந்தது. எனவே நீலச் சீர்திருத்தம் கொண்டுவர முடியவில்லை. நீலச் சீர்திருத்தம் வேகமாக கொண்டுவர வேண்டுமானால் 19-வது ஆர்டிக்ள் திருத்தப்படவேண்டும் என்று தேர்தல் சமயத்திலே பல்லாடகங்கனக்கான மக்களுக்கு முன்னால் சொன்னார். மக்கள் நேருவின் சீர்திருத்தம் நம்பினார்கள். தேர்தலுக்கு பின் சட்டத்தை திருத்தி நீலச்சீர்திருத்தத்தை அமுல் நடத்த நேரு முயற்சிப்பார் என்று ஆவலோடு எதிர்பார்க்கிறார்கள்.”

“இது ஜனநாயக சகாப்தம். ஜனங்கள் ஆட்சி பொறுப்பில் பங்கு கொள்ளத் துடி துடிக்கும் சகாப்தம். தங்களுக்கு விரிவான பிரதிநிதித்துவம் வேண்டுமென்று ஜனங்கள் விரும்புகிற சகாப்தம். இந்த சகாப்தத்தில், பார்லிமென்டின் அங்கத்தினர்கள் 500 பேருக்கும் மேலே போகக்கூடாது, ஜனத்தொகை அதிகரித்தாலும் கூட அதற்கேற்றபடி பிரதிநிதித்துவம் வீதாசாரத்தை மாற்றிக் கொள்ளவேண்டும் என்ற அடிப்படையில் இந்தத் திருத்தம் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டு இருக்கிறது. காலுக்கு ஏற்ற செருப்பு வேண்டுமா அல்லது செருப்புக்கு தக்கபடி காலு மாற்றிக்கொள்வதா இது தான் நமமுன்னே உள்ள பிரச்சனை! உண்மையில் சர்க்கார் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கும் இந்தத் திருத்தத்தை ஜனநாயக ஆர்வம் படைத்த யாராலும் ஒப்புக்கொள்ள முடியாது.

“சட்ட சபை மெம்பர்களைவிட, அதிகப்படியான ஜனங்களை பார்லிமெண்ட் மெம்பர்கள் பிரதிநிதித்தவம் படுத்துகிறார்கள். பார்லிமெண்டுக்குச் சென்று பேசுவதும், விவாதிப்பதும் மாதிரம் அல்ல அவர்கள் வேலை. மக்கள் மத்தியில் அடிக்கடி செல்வதும், அவர்கள் தினசரி பிரச்னைகளை அறிவதும் அதற்கான பரிகாரங்களைத் தேடுவதும் அவர்கள் வேலை. இதைச் சரியாகச் செய்யவேண்டுமானால், அவர்களை பிரதிநிதித்தவப்படுத்தும் ஜனங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை குறுகியதாக இருக்கவேண்டும். அதை அதிகரிப்பது எவ்விதத்திலும் சரியானதல்ல. அது ஜனநாயக விரோதிகளின் செயல். எனவே இத்கிருத்தத்தை என்னை ஆதரிக்க முடியாது என்று கூறி அமர்கிறேன்.”

* SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :— “ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ ഞാൻ ശബരിപ്പൂർ എൻ്റിക്കുകയാണ് ചെയ്യുന്നത്. ഈ പ്രമേയത്തിന് അനുകൂലമായി കൊണ്ടുവന്ന പ്രധാനമായ ഷട്ട് വാദഗതികൾ ഇന്ത്യ ഒരു വിന്യാസരേഖയായി രാജ്യമാണകിലും ഇവിടെ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് അസംബ്ലികൾ ഉണ്ടെന്നും ഇന്ത്യ വിദ്യാഭ്യാസപരമായി വളരെ പിന്നോക്കം നില്ക്കുന്ന ഒരു രാജ്യമാണെന്നുമാണ്. സ്റ്റേറ്റ് അസംബ്ലികൾ ഉണ്ടായാലും കേന്ദ്ര പാർലിമെൻ്റിലുള്ള പ്രാതിനിധ്യം കറക്ഷയോണെങ്കിൽ ജനങ്ങളുടെ രാഷ്ട്രങ്ങളെ പ്രതിഫലിപ്പിക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള കഴിവ് കറഞ്ഞുപോകുമെന്ന കാര്യത്തെക്കുറിച്ച് സമാധു ജീവാനന്തരം യുക്തിപൂർവ്വം ഇവിടെ വാദിച്ചുകുറിഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നു. ഇന്ത്യയുടെ വിദ്യാഭ്യാസ ഹീനതയെ അടിസ്ഥാനമാക്കി പാർലിമെൻ്റ് അംഗങ്ങളുടെ എണ്ണം കറക്ഷൻതിനെ ന്യായീകരിച്ചുകൊണ്ടുള്ള വാദഗതി ഉന്നയിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളത്

‘రాజ్యాంగ చట్టానికి ఈ సవరణను లీకుకొని రావలసిన ఆగత్యాన్ని తెలియ జేస్తూ ప్రభుత్వంవారు, 1951 వ సం॥ జనాభా లెక్కల ప్రకారం అంచనా వేయబడిన దానికన్న అధనంగా ప్రజల దేశంలో ఉన్నట్లు తెలింది కాబట్టి నియోజకవర్గములలో ఉండవలసిన ఓటర్ల సంఖ్యకు గరిష్ట ప్రమాణం తొలగించవలసివచ్చినదని చెప్పారు. ఈ చర్యలలో ప్రమాదకరమైన ఫలితాలు ఇబ్బడిఉన్నాయి. కోట్ల కొద్ది నియోజకవర్గాలలో కనిష్ట (minimum) ప్రమాణంలోనే ఓటర్లు ఉండవచ్చు. ఇతర నియో

[Sri K. Krishna Rao]

[9th March 1953]

జక వర్గాలలోని ఓటర్ల సంఖ్యకు ఒక పరిమితి అంటూ విధించడం దీనివల్ల కాంగ్రెస్ వారికి పలుకుబడి ఉండే ప్రాంతాలలో చిన్న చిన్న నియోజకవర్గాలు వారు పలుకుబడి కోల్పోయిన ప్రాంతాలలో పెద్ద పెద్ద నియోజకవర్గాలు ఉండే ప్రమాదం ఉంది. ఈ సవరణను అవకాశంగా తీసుకొని దానిని రాజకీయ ప్రయోజనాలకుగాను అధికార మూలం ఉన్న పక్షాలవారు ఉపయోగించుకోవచ్చు, నియోజకవర్గాలను ఏర్పాటు చేయడంతో ఓటర్ల సంఖ్యను గాక, ప్రాంతాన్ని మాత్రమే ప్రమాణంగా తీసుకోవడం ప్రజాతంత్ర సిద్ధాంతానికి విరుద్ధం. ఈనాడు జరుగుతున్న విషయాలు గమనించండి. కరువు కాల కాలవల్ల దక్షిణాది ప్రాంతాలకు తమిళ ప్రజలు ఉత్తరాది ప్రాంతాలకు అంధ్ర జిల్లాలకు వలస పోతున్నారు. తత్ఫలితంగా తమిళ జిల్లాలలో జనాభా తగ్గడం, అంధ్ర జిల్లాలలో జనాభా పెరగడం సంభవిస్తోంది. అయినప్పటికీ తమిళ జిల్లాలలోను అంధ్ర జిల్లాలలోను నియోజకవర్గాలు పూర్వంలాగే ఉంటాయి అంతేకాకుండా తక్కువ జనాభానున్న ప్రాంతాలకు ఎక్కువ జనాభానున్న ప్రాంతాలకు ఒకే విధమైన (representation) వుంటుంది. ఇది అభివృద్ధి నిరోధకమైన పద్ధతి.

“ఇక సాంఘికంగా కలిగే ఆనందాలను గమనించవలసివుంది. మన దేశం వ్యవసాయ దేశం, గ్రామాలలోని భూమి నానాటికి పెత్తనదార్లు, పెద్ద పెద్ద భూస్వాముల హస్తాధిక్తి పోతోంది. వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు, చిన్న చిన్న భూస్వాములు నిరుద్యోగులై పోతున్నారు. తృప్తి లేకుండా పోతుంది. వ్యవసాయ పరిశ్రమ వికృతమైపోతుంది. గ్రామాలలో జీవనోపాధి గడించుకొనే అవకాశం లేకపోవడం చేత కర్షకులు, వ్యవసాయ కూలీలపట్ల వాసాలు చేరుతున్నారు. తత్ఫలితంగా గ్రామీణ నియోజకవర్గాలలోని ఓటర్ల సంఖ్య తగ్గిపోతోంది. పట్టణాలలోని నియోజకవర్గాలలోని ఓటర్ల సంఖ్య విపరీతంగా పెరిగిపోతుంది. అంతేకాక గ్రామీణ నియోజకవర్గాలలో భూస్వాముల పలుకుబడికి లోను కావలసినవారే ఉండగల ప్రమాదం ఉంది. రాజకీయంగా చైతన్యం గల పట్టణవాసం ప్రజలకు భూస్వామ్య విధానం క్రింద నలిగిపోతూ, అస్వతంత్రులుగా ఉండే గ్రామీణ ప్రజలకు విశేష ప్రాతినిధ్యం లభ్యమవుతోంది. Rural areas కు urban areas కు ఒకే విధమైన representation ఉండునట్లు చేయవలెను కాని, విశేష వ్యత్యాసముండునట్లు చేయకూడదు. దీనివల్ల సాంఘికంగా వచ్చే పరిణామాలు ఆత్మంత ప్రమాదకరంగా ఉంటాయి. దీనివల్ల అభివృద్ధి నిరోధక భూస్వామి వర్గానికి ఎక్కువ ప్రాతినిధ్యం కలుగుతుంది. Working class కు తగిన ప్రాతినిధ్యం లభించకుండా ఉండేందుకు దోడ్పడుతుంది. ఈ విధానం France లో కూడ ప్రవేశపెట్టారు. Progressive vote ని, re-actionary vote తో swamp చేయాలనే ప్రయత్నం యొక్క ఫలితమిది.

“ఈ ప్రాతినిధ్యం పట్టంలో దేశంలోని A, B, C తరగతి రాష్ట్రాలకు ఇచ్చిన ప్రాతినిధ్యం చూస్తే, ముఖ్యంగా C తరగతి రాష్ట్రాలకు weightage ఇవ్వబడింది. ఈ ప్రత్యేక సదుపాయం కలుగజేయుటవల్ల సంభవించే అసద్దాలు చాలా ఉన్నాయి. ఈ C తరగతి రాష్ట్రాలు ఎంతో కాలంగా రాజుల చేతులలో ఉన్నాయి. ఆ ప్రాంతాలలో ప్రజా తంత్రానికి ఎంత మూత్రం అవకాశం వుండేది కాదు. నియంతృత్వం క్రింద ప్రజలు నలిగిపోయి తక్కువ రాజకీయ చైతన్యం కలిగి ఉన్నారు. ఈ నాటికి కూడా వాసన విధానాలు యీ ప్రాంతాలలో అమలులో వున్నాయి. పెత్తనదార్లు, జమీందారులు నియంతృత్వం సాగిస్తారు యీ ప్రాంతాలలో. ఇట్టి ప్రాంతాలకు విశేష ప్రాతినిధ్యం ఇచ్చినట్లయితే అభివృద్ధి నిరోధకులే అధిక స్వంభూతు

9th March 1953] [Sri K. Krishna Rao]

లుగా శాసన సభలోనికి ప్రవేశించే ప్రమాదం ఉంది. కాబట్టి ఈనాడు ప్రభుత్వం వారు ఆవలంబిస్తున్న పద్ధతి ప్రజాతంత్ర విధానాన్ని సర్వనాశనం చేస్తుందని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.

“ ఇంకొక విషయం గమనించండి. యీ రాజ్యాంగ చట్ట సవరణ అమలులోనికి వస్తే, ముఖ్యంగా ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రానికి ఎంతో అన్యాయం జరిగే ప్రమాదం ఉంది. ఆంధ్ర దేశంలో కాంగ్రెస్ పార్టీ పలుకుబడి కోల్పోయిందనే విషయం అందరికీ తెలిసినదే. ఆ పరిస్థితులలో నియోజక వర్గాలలోని వోటర్ల సంఖ్యకు upper limit లేకపోవడంవల్ల ఆంధ్రలో చాలా ప్రాంతాలలో పెద్దపెద్ద నియోజక వర్గాలు ఏర్పాటు చేయబడవచ్చు. ఇతర రాజకీయ పక్షాలవారు అధిక సంఖ్యలలో రాకుండా చేయబడుతూ అధికారంలో ఉన్న కాంగ్రెస్ పక్షంవారు చేస్తున్న కుట్రగానే దీనిని భావించవలసివున్నది. అభివృద్ధి నిరోధకుల నియంతృత్వాన్ని దేశంలో నిరాఘటుంగా అమలుజరుపడానికి దేశంలో ప్రజాతంత్ర విధానాన్ని రద్దుచేయడానికి మాత్రమే ఈ సవరణ ఉపకరిస్తుందేమోగాని ఇది ఎంతమాత్రం ప్రజాతంత్ర విధానం కాదని గుర్తించవలసి ఉంది. ఆంధ్ర దేశంలో ప్రజాస్వామిక శక్తులు పొందిన విజయానికి భయపడి కాంగ్రెస్ వారు పన్నుతున్న కుతంత్రాలు మాత్రమేగాని, ఈ తీర్మానము వేరుగాదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. భూస్వాముల పెత్తనదార్ల అభివృద్ధికి నిరోధకుల పలుకుబడి తగ్గిపోకుండా ప్రజలను రాజకీయంగాను, సాంఘికంగాను, ఆర్థికంగాను అణచివేయడమే ఈ రాజ్యాంగ చట్ట సవరణ తీర్మానంయొక్క అంతరార్థమని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను.

“ అంతేకాకుండా నియోజకవర్గంలో ఉండవలసిన వోటర్ల సంఖ్యకు గరిష్ట ప్రమాణం ఏదీ లేకపోవుటవల్ల కాంగ్రెస్ వారి పలుకుబడి ఏ కొద్దిగానో ఇంకా నిలచియున్న చోట తక్కువ నుండితో నియోజకవర్గాన్ని ఏర్పాటుచేయడం, ఇతర పార్టీలవారి ప్రాబల్యం, పలుకుబడి అధికం ఉన్న చోట హెచ్చుమంది వోటర్లు గల పెద్ద నియోజక వర్గాన్ని ఏర్పాటుచేయడం మాత్రమే సంభవిస్తుంది. గత ఎన్నికల ఆనుభవంబట్టి చూచుకొన్నట్లైతే delimitation అనే పేరుతో ఎన్నికల తంత్రాలు సాగించారో మనకు తెలుస్తుంది. Delimitation సక్రమంగా న్యాయంగా జరుగుతుందని దానిలో impartial మనఃస్థులు వుంటారని చెప్పినారు కాని, వీరి impartiality, కేవలం మిథ్యయని విదితమైనది. ఇటువంటి అన్యాయాలకు లాభపడదని ప్రభుత్వంవారు, వారి ముఠావారు వాదించవచ్చు కాని వీరుచెప్పే impartiality కేవలం మిథ్యయని మనం తెలుసుకోవాలి. సాధారణంగా దేశం మొత్తమీద, జనాభాకు ఒక్క proportion తోనే, పార్లమెంటుకు, ప్రతిష్ఠాంతానికి representation యిస్తామని constituencies ఏర్పాటు చేస్తామని చెప్పారు. కాని యీవిషయంచూస్తే, as far as practicable అనే షరతుతో యీ clause చెప్పబడుతున్నది. యిటువంటి షరతులు అవరణలో చాలా ప్రమాదంగా వుంటుంది. ఈ as far as practicable అనే దానికి ఖచ్చితమైన అర్థమేదీలేదు. దానిక్రింద ఏదైనా చేయవచ్చు. ఇటువంటి vague గా ఉండే పదాలవల్ల ప్రయోజనం ఏదీ ఉండదు. ఇటువంటి పదాలను clause లలోచేర్చి అధికారంలో ఉన్న కాంగ్రెస్ వారు చాలా అక్రమాలకు పడిగడుతున్నారు. ఉదాహరణకు యిటువంటి సాకులతోనే మనస్థులను పోలీసు స్టేషన్లకు తీసుగెళ్లడం చంపివేయడం జరిగింది. ఈ సవరణను చేయడంవల్ల ముఖ్యంగా ఆంధ్రదేశంలోని నియోజక వర్గాల సంఖ్యను తగ్గించి వేయడానికి కాంగ్రెస్ వారు సర్వవిధాలా ప్రయత్నం చేస్తారు. పురోభివృద్ధి అరికట్టటానికి కాంగ్రెస్ వారికి ఇది ఒక ఊతగా

[Sri K. Krishna Rao]

[9th March 1954]

ఉంటుంది. మాప్రాంతాల్లో ఇందువల్ల కొన్ని కొన్ని నిమోజక వర్గాలలో, 10, 15 లక్షల వరకుకూడా వోటర్లు ఉండే పూదం ఏర్పడుతుంది. ప్రభుత్వానికి ఆంధ్రలను అనగగొట్టడం మొకవైపురి అవుతుంది. మేము చేసినపాపం మేము స్వతంత్ర ప్రియలను వుండడమే నిరంకుశాధికారం చెలాయించే కాంగ్రెస్ వారికి మామీద కన్నెరగా ఉండవచ్చు. తత్ఫలితమే ఇటువంటి సవరణ. ఆంధ్రుల స్వాతంత్ర ప్రియత్వాన్ని అనచి చేయడం, ఆంధ్ర ప్రజాభిప్రాయాన్ని తూడ్డిభావంతో చూడడం మాత్రమే ఈ సవరణ తీర్మానంలో ప్రతిబంధం చేస్తున్నాయని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. పూర్వంవలె, రాజకీయ monopoly కాంగ్రెసుకు లేదని, గతంపై కలలో తెలిసింది. అందువల్లనే ఎన్నికల అనంతరమే యీ సవరణ తెచ్చింది యీ ప్రభుత్వం. బహుశా యంతకు ముందువలె కాంగ్రెసుకు వక monopoly వుంది అని తోచివుంటే యిట్టి సవరణ ప్రభుత్వం తెచ్చివుండేదాదు. ఇది కొంతమంది ప్రభుత్వ పక్ష సభ్యులు ఈ సవరణను బలపరుస్తూ మన రాష్ట్రాల్లో శాసనసభలు వున్నవి కనుక, చిన్న చిన్న నియోజక వర్గములున్నవి కనుక పార్లమెంటుకు 500 మంది కన్న సభ్యులు ఉండనక్కరలేదని, ఈ సవరణవల్ల ప్రజలకు ఎట్టి అన్యాయం జరగదని తెలియజేశారు. వారితో నేను ఏకీభవించ జాలనని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. పరిపాలనకు సంబంధించినంతవరకు central subjects అని, provincial subjects అని ఉన్నవి. రాష్ట్రప్రభుత్వానికి సంబంధించిన విషయాలు మాత్రమే మేము చర్చించ వలెవుతుంది. కాని కేంద్రానికి సంబంధించిన విషయాలలో రాష్ట్ర శాసన సభ్యులు జోక్యం కలుగజేసు కోవడానికి ఎంతమాత్రం అవకాశంలేదు. ఉదాహరణకు మా నెల్లూరుజిల్లా విషయం మనవి చేస్తాను. ఆ జిల్లాలో రైలు సౌకర్యాలు చాలాతక్కువ. మొత్తంమీద ఆంధ్ర దేశానికి రైలు సౌకర్యాలు తగ్గించబడ్డాయి ఆంధ్ర జిల్లాలో చాలాభాగం బస్ ప్రయాణంమీదనే చేయవలసిఉన్నది. బస్ యజమానులు, పెట్రోలు interests కు అనువుగా వుండేందుకే రైలు సౌకర్యాలు తగ్గింప బడ్డాయని చాలామంది అనుకుంటున్నారు. రైలు సౌకర్యాలు అభివృద్ధి చేయవలసినదని ఆంధ్రలోని యీ శాసన సభలో ఏమీచేయలేకున్నాము. ఈ subjects కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి సంబంధించినటువంటివి కనుక మేమేమీ చేయలేకున్నాం. ఈ విధంగా పరిపాలనకు సంబంధించిన విషయాలు రెండు water-tight compartments క్రింద విభజింపబడినవి. కనుక ఆయా శాసన సభలలోను, పార్లమెంటులోను సరియైన ప్రాతినిధ్యముండాలని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. లేకపోతే ప్రజాశయాలు నెరవేరుటకుగాని, ప్రజాభిప్రాయం వ్యక్తమవుటకుగాని వీలుండడంలేదు. అంతేకాకుండా జిల్లాలో స్థానిక సంస్థలున్నవి కనుక పార్లమెంటులో ఎక్కువ ప్రాతినిధ్యం లేకపోయినా పరవాలేదని కొందరంటున్నారు. పంచాయితీలు, జిల్లాబోర్డులు, మునిసిపాలిటీలు ప్రభుత్వంవారి రొమ్మకు తాబేదార్ల సంస్థలుగా పనిచేయ వలసినవేకాని వాటికి ఎట్టిస్వాతంత్ర్యంలేదు. ఈ విషయం ఈ స్థానిక సంస్థల పైని ఉంటుంది, చేర్చునుకూడా అంగీకరిస్తున్నారు. వారి వారి సమావేశాలలో ఈ పరిస్థితులను చక్కపరచ వలసినదని తీర్మానాలు పాస్ చేసి ప్రభుత్వంవారికి పంపించారు. కాబట్టి స్థానిక సంస్థలు, రాష్ట్ర శాసన సభలు ఉండడంచేత పార్లమెంటులో ప్రాతినిధ్యం ఆక్రమింపలేదనడం సమంజసంకాదు.

10-50
a.m.

“జనాభా ఎక్కువ అయినది కనుక ప్రాతినిధ్యాన్ని మరింతం చేయవలసినదని కొందరు చెప్పారు. ప్రతి విషయానికి జనాభా పెరుగుదలను సాకుగా తీసుకొంటున్నారు. కరువు కాటకాలు దేశంలో తొండవిస్తున్నాయి తగిన చర్యలు తీసుకోవలసినదని కోరితే జనాభా పెరిగిందిగాని, ఆహారధాన్యాల ఉత్పత్తి పెరగలేదు ఏమి

9th March 1953] [Sri K. Krishna Rao]

చేయగలం అని ప్రభుత్వంవారు కొంటిసానులు చెబుతారు. ఈ జనాభా లెఖనం విషయం కూడా మనం తెలుసుకోవాలి. మన ప్రభుత్వానికి వారి లెఖనంలో వారికి నమ్మకం లేదు. ఉదాహరణకు ప్రభుత్వ రిపోర్టులలో కలరావల్ల చనిపోయినవారి సంఖ్య హెచ్చినట్లు లెఖనంజూపి దానిక్రిందవారు చెబుతారు. యీ హెచ్చుదల కేవలం ఎక్కువమంది చనిపోయినందువల్ల కాదని, Reporting ఎక్కువ Efficient అయినందువల్ల పెరుగుదల అయిందని చెబుతారు. ఆ విధంగా జనాభా లెఖనంలో కొందరు చేర్చబడకుండా ఉన్నారు. ఉదాహరణకు, నాకు తెలుసు. కొందరు జనాభా లెఖనంలో చేరితే టీకాలు వేస్తారని భయంకొద్దీ లెఖనంలో తమవేరు చేర్చనివ్వరు. నిజమైన ప్రజాప్రతినిధులు శాసన సభలలో ఉన్నట్లైతే ప్రజా స్వతంత్ర్యానికూర్చి పాటుబడతారు. పౌరహక్కులను వృద్ధిచేస్తున్నారు. ప్రజలు ప్రభుత్వ లెఖనంలో చేర్చబడుట, తమ హక్కులు చలాయించేందుకు తోడ్పడుతుందని చెప్పి ఎక్కువమంది ప్రభుత్వజనాభా ఎలక్షన్ లెఖనంలో చేరేటట్లు చేస్తారు. అందువల్ల జనాభా లెఖనంలో పెరుగుదల ప్రజల రాజకీయస్థాయి పెరుగుతూన్న కొలది పెరుగుతుంది. కాని గొర్రావిధంగా ప్రజల సంఖ్య పెరుగుతూన్నా వారి ప్రతినిధుల సంఖ్యను తగ్గించడం కాస్త ప్రజలరాజకీయ వైతన్యాభివృద్ధిని చూడలేక, వానిని అణగారేట్లులే ఆచుతుంది. సమరణ ఫలితం మన దేశ చరిత్రలో ఎప్పుడు రాజ్యాంగ చట్టనిర్మాణం వచ్చినా ఆప్పుడు ఈ దేశంలో martial law ప్రయోగించడం పరిపాటి అయిపోయింది. 1935 వ సంవత్సరంలో బ్రిటీష్ ప్రభుత్వం కొత్త రాజ్యాంగ చట్టాని, రాండులేబిల్ సమావేశానంతరం శాసించారు. ఆ రాజ్యాంగ చట్టం శాసించే రోజులలో ఆనాడు స్వాతంత్రోద్యమాన్ని నడుపుతున్న కాంగ్రెస్ వారివైన బ్రిటీష్ ప్రభుత్వంవారు martial law ఉపయోగించారు. లాఠీచార్జీలు ఎరెష్టులు చేశారు. ఆ నేకవిధాల స్వాతంత్రోద్యమాన్ని అణగదొక్కటానికి ప్రయత్నం చేశారు. ఇక కాంగ్రెస్ ప్రభుత్వంవారు 1949-50 సంవత్సరాలలో సూతన రాజ్యాంగ చట్టనిర్మాణంలోనికి తెచ్చారు. ఆనాడు కూడా ముఖ్యంగా ఆంధ్రదేశంలో martial law తుల్యమైనటువంటి దమ నగిలి విధానమే అమలులో వుంచారు. మలబారు పోలీసు, ఇతర సాయధ పోలీసులు ప్రజలను కాల్చి వేశారు. preventive detention చట్టం అమలులో ఉంది. పోలీసు క్యాంపులు ఆంధ్రలో నెలకొల్పబడ్డాయి. ఈనాడు కూడా ప్రమేత పరిస్థితులలో ప్రజాప్రతినిధ్యాన్ని పరిమితంచేయటానికి ప్రజాతంత్రాన్ని అరికట్టడానికి ప్రజాతంత్ర విధానాన్ని నాశనంచేయడానికి కాంగ్రెస్ ప్రభుత్వం సర్వవిధముల ప్రయత్నంచేస్తు ఇది అభివృద్ధినిరోధకమైన పంథా జాతీయభద్రమంలో అయివున్నవారంతా యీపద్ధతినీ వ్యతిరేకించాలి. ప్రజాప్రతినిధ్యాన్ని తగ్గించివేసే ప్రయత్నాని ప్రజా స్వామ్యవాదులంతా తీవ్రంగా ఎదిరించవలసిఉంది,

“ఇంకొక విషయం మనవి చేస్తాను. Constituency చిన్నదిగా ఉన్నట్లైతే మధ్య తరగతికి చెందినవారు, ప్రజాసామాన్యానికి చెందినవారు ఎన్నికలలో పాల్గొనవచ్చు. అట్లుకాక పెద్ద పెద్ద నియోజకవర్గాలనున్నట్లైతే బాగా డబ్బుఖర్చుపెట్టగలవారికే ఎన్నికలలో పాల్గొనగల అవకాశం ఏర్పడుతుంది. అందువల్ల ధనవంతులు భూస్వాములు మాత్రమే శాసన సభలలోనికి రాగలుగుతారు. కాబట్టి అభివృద్ధినిరోధకమైన ఈ సమరణ ప్రజా స్వామ్యకాములందరు వ్యతిరేకించవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను.”

* SRI S. RAMASAMY NAIDU :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, while we have to congratulate the framers of the Constitution,

[Sri S. Ramasamy Naidu]

[9th March 1953]

which has proved to be very sound, we have at the same time to congratulate ourselves on the stronger Constitution which we have possessed all these years. We have added to our numbers to such an extent that it has necessitated our legislators at the Centre to consider a re-distribution of the parliamentary constituencies. Whether increase in population is necessary, warranted, or conducive to the public welfare, and whether the same rate of growth ought to be kept up in the ensuing years, is a matter which I leave to others to discuss. For my part, I would say that the re-distribution of the constituencies does not affect anybody or any territory at all. Because, if we are to take it that the growth of population is proportionate in every district, I do not think any major territorial jurisdiction will be added to the parliamentary constituencies. The growth of the population in the particular areas will be equal to the distribution which would be made at the rate of 500 members. Whether the strength of 500 members should be increased, is a different matter. Our parliamentarians have decided that it is not necessary. Of course, the additional strength of the population now will be not effective voting population for nine more years. All those who have come into existence in the past ten years will get their votes after nine years. So, as the distribution is made on the population basis and not on the voting basis, there will be no difficulty in the re-arrangement of the territorial constituencies. Therefore there is nothing to fear from extra territory being added to the constituencies and people put to more difficulties in the matter of carrying on propaganda and spending money."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, I would like to inform the hon. Member that the election law of the last election was governed by Article 387 for which the President made a special census of the population. For the next election, a new arrangement will come into force. The delimitation committee has been appointed and some Members of this House are also on the delimitation committee. Therefore, by passing this amendment, we will be giving effect to the amendment immediately and not after nine years."

* SRI S. RAMASAMY NAIDU :—" Sir, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has misunderstood my remarks. All I said was that the increase in population which had taken place in the last ten years would have voting strength only after nine years when they would attain age. Anyway, since our elders have not chosen to increase the strength of the Central Legislature, we have to adjust ourselves. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked whether it would not be possible to increase the strength of the Central Legislature. I think it might be possible. It might be that every Assembly in the country will have to pass a resolution that the strength of the Central Legislature may be increased in proportion to the increase in population. This may force the legislators at the Centre or the Government there to reconsider their decision. As matters stand at present, we have been asked to ratify the

9th March 1953] [Sri S. Ramasamy Naidu]

Parliament's decision to remove the upper limit of the parliamentary constituency. This will neither affect the territory nor the voting strength for nine years to come. There is nothing to fear from the increase in touring expenses. Therefore, I would submit that this amendment should be ratified by this Assembly."

* **SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN** :—"கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே! இந்தத் தீர்மானம் பொதுத் தேர்தல் நடந்த பிறகு நாட்டில் ஜனத்தொகை அதிகமாக இருக்கின்றபடியால் அதிக ஜனத்தொகைக்குத் தகுந்தபடி பிரதிநிதிகளின் எண்ணிக்கையை எப்படித் தீர்மானிப்பது என்பதற்காக நடு அரசாங்கத்தாரால் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கின்றது. ஜனத்தொகை அதிகமானால் நடு அரசாங்கத்தின் சட்டசபையில் எப்படி அதிகப் பிரதிநிதிகள் சேர்த்துக்கொள்வது என்ற கேள்வியின் கீழ், இந்திய அரசியல் சட்டத்தின் 81 (1) ஏ பிரிவில் நடு சட்டசபைப் பிரதிநிதிகள் 500-க்கு மேற்பட்டு இருக்கக் கூடாதென்ற காரணத்தினால் 81 (1) (பி) பிரிவின்படி அரசியல் சட்டத்திற்குத் திருத்தம் கொண்டு வரவேண்டிய அவசியம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அதற்கு முன்பு இருந்ததுபோல் ஏழு லக்ஷத்து, ஐம்பது ஆயிரம் பேருக்கு ஒருவர் இருப்பதா அல்லது அதற்கு மேலான ஜனத்தொகைக்கு ஒருவர் இருப்பதா என்ற கேள்வி எழுகிறது. முன்பு பொதுத் தேர்தலின்போது 31 கோடி சொச்சம் ஜனத்தொகை இருந்ததாக கணக்கெடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. முன்வை விட இப்பொழுது அதிகமாக 36 கோடி ஜனத்தொகை இருக்கின்ற காரணத்தினாலும், ஆகவே இப்பொழுது முன் விதிப்படி முன்வை விட அதிகமாகப் பிரதிநிதிகள் வரவேண்டியிருப்பதாலும், மொத்தப் பிரதிநிதிகள் 500 பேர்களுக்கு மேல் இருக்கக் கூடாதென்ற காரணத்தினாலும், ஒவ்வொரு பிரதிநிதிக்கும் உரிய ஜனத்தொகையை அதிகமாக்க வேண்டிய அவசியம் ஏற்பட்டு இந்தத் திருத்தத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்திருப்பதினால் இந்தத் திருத்தத்தை நான் ஆதரிக்கின்றேன். இப்படிச் செய்வதை விட நடு அரசாங்கத்தின் பிரதிநிதிகள் 500 பேர்களுக்கு மேலாக இருக்கலாமென்று ஒரு முடிவு ஏற்பட்டிருக்குமானால், அந்தக் காரணத்திற்காக அரசியல் சட்டம் 81 (1) ஏ பிரிவை திருத்தவேண்டுமென்று அரசாங்கம் முடிவு செய்திருக்குமானால் அது இதைவிட இன்னும் ரொம்பவும் அதிகமாக வரவேற்கத்தக்கது என்று நான் சொல்லிக்கொண்டு இதை ஆமோதிக்கிறேன்."

11
a.m.

* **SRI S. RAMALINGAM** :—"கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே! நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் அரசியல் சட்ட திருத்த மசோதாவை இந்த சபை ஆதரிக்க வேண்டுமெனக் கோரி கொண்டு வந்திருக்கும் தீர்மானத்தை நான் எதிர்க்கின்றேன். ஏனென்றால் அரசியல் சட்டத்திலே இப்பொழுது எந்தப் பகுதியை திருத்தவேண்டுமென்று குறிப்பிடுகிறார்களோ அதற்கு மேலே உள்ள கருத்து 500 அங்கத்தினருக்கு மேல் மக்கள் மன்றத்தில் அங்கத்தினர்கள் இருக்கக் கூடாதென்பதாக இருப்பதினாலும் இப்பொழுது இந்தியாவில் அதிகம் ஜனத்தொகை பெருகி இருப்பதினாலும் இம்மாதிரி திருத்த மசோதா கொண்டுவர வேண்டியிருக்கிறது என்று சொல்லப்படுகிறது. அது மட்டுமல்ல. ஒவ்வொரு பத்து வருஷத்திற்கும் இந்த மாதிரியாக அரசியல் சட்டத்தைத் திருத்த வேண்டி இருப்பதினால் உயர்ந்த பக்ஷ ஜனத்தொகை இருக்க வேண்டியதில்லையென்று சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் வாதங்கள் சொல்லப்படுகிறது. ஆனால் இந்தத் திருத்த மசோதா இரண்டாம் திருத்த மசோதா என்று குறிப்பிடப்பட்டிருப்பதிலிருந்து அரசியல் சட்டம் அமுலுக்கு வந்து இரண்டொரு வருஷங்களுக்குள்ளேயே இரண்டு தடவைகள் திருத்தவேண்டிய அவசியம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும்பொழுது சுமார் பத்து வருஷங்களுக்கு ஒரு தடவை இதைத் திருத்தவதில் என்ன சிரமம் அரசாங்கத்தாருக்கு இருக்கப்போகிறதென்று தான் எனக்குத் தெரியவில்லை. ஆகவே ஏதோ ஒரு உள்ளக் கருத்தை வைத்துக்கொண்டு தான் இம்மாதிரியாக வெளிப்படையாக ஏதோ ஒரு காரணத்தை, பொருத்தமற்றதாக இருந்தாலும் கூட, கூறிக்கொண்டு அதிகபக்ஷம் குறிப்பிட்டிருப்பதை எடுத்து விடவேண்டுமென்று சர்க்கார் திருத்தம் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறது."

[Sri S. Ramalingam]

[9th March 1953]

கிராமங்களோ என்று சந்தேகப்படவேண்டிய நிலையில் நாங்கள் எல்லோரும் இருக்கிறோம். ஏனென்றால் சமீபத்தில் நடந்த பொதுத் தேர்தலிலும், அதற்குப் பிறகு முனிசிபல், அல்லது பஞ்சாயத்துப் போர்டு தேர்தலிலும் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் முடிவுகளைப் பார்க்கும்பொழுது அதிகாரத்தில் இருக்கக் கூடிய கட்சியார் தாங்களே மீண்டும், மீண்டும் பதவிக்கு வந்து கொண்டிருக்கும் வகையில் தொகுதிகளை தங்களுக்குச் சாதகமாகப் பிரித்துக் கொள்ளக்கூடிய ஒரு சந்தர்ப்ப நிலை ஏற்படும். இப்படிச் சந்தேகப்படுவதற்கும் நிறைய காரணங்கள் சென்ற பொதுத் தேர்தலின் பொழுதே நாங்கள் காட்டமுடியும். ஏனென்றால் ஒரு தொகுதி என்றால் அதிக பக்கமாக எவ்வளவு வோட்டர்கள் இருக்கவேண்டுமென்று நிர்ணயிக்காது குறைந்தது ஐந்து லக்ஷம் இருக்க வேண்டுமென்று நிர்ணயித்திருப்பதால் ஒரு தொகுதியில் ஐந்து லக்ஷம் ஜனங்களும், மற்றொரு தொகுதியில் 15 லக்ஷம் ஜனங்களும் இருக்க வசதி ஏற்படும். ஆகவே இப்படிப்பட்ட வித்தியாசத்தை உண்டுபண்ண விரும்புவோருக்குச் சந்தர்ப்பம் அளிக்கும் வகையில் ஒரு மசோதா இருக்கக் கூடாதென்பதே என் அபிப்பிராயம். குறிப்பாக மற்றொன்று. இந்த அரசியல் சட்டமே மக்களின் அரசியல் சட்டம் என்றும், மக்களால் தங்கள் நலனுக்காகச் செய்து கொள்ளப்பட்ட அரசியல் சட்டம் என்றும் சொல்ல முடியாது. பொது மக்களால் தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப் படாத, 1935-ம் வருட அரசியல் சட்டப்படி தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்ட மக்களின் மதிப்பைப் பெறாது அரசியல் அரங்கத்தில் வீற்றிருந்த அங்கத்தினர்களால் செய்யப்பட்டது. அப்படிப்பட்டவர்களே அதிக பக்க ஜனத்தொகை ஒரு தொகுதிக்கு நிர்ணயிக்க வேண்டுமென்று அரசியல் சட்டத்தில் ஒரு ஏற்பாடு செய்து வைத்திருக்கும்பொழுது அதை மாற்றுவதற்கு நாம் எப்படி முயற்சி எடுக்க முடியுமென்று நான் கேட்கிறேன். அந்த அரசியல் சட்டமே சரியல்ல என்பதாக ஜனநாயக வாதிட்கள் ஆக்சேப்டேஷன் எழுப்பிக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். பொது மக்களின் நலனுக்காக வகுக்கப்பட்டதொரு அரசியல் சட்டம் அது அல்ல இருந்தும் கூட இன்றையதினம் அந்தச் சட்டத்தில் மக்களின் சார்பாகக் காட்டப்பட்டிருக்கும் ஒரு சிறிய சலுகையையும் கூட இப்பொழுது பறித்துவிடக்கூடிய வகையில் இந்தச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வரும்பொழுது இதை எதிர்க்க வேண்டியிருக்கிறதே தவிர ஆதரிக்க முடியாது. ஆனால் வாதங்கள் சொல்லப்படுகிறது. “500 க்குமேலாகப் பிரதி நிதிகள் உட்கார்ந்தால் ஒரு சிலருக்குத் தான் பிரச்சங்கம் செய்வதற்கு சந்தர்ப்பம் கிடைக்கும். ஆனால் ஏராளமான பணச்செலவு ஏற்படும். வாதங்கள் சரியாக நடைபெறாது. நிர்வாகக் குந்தகங்கள் வேறு அனேகம் ஏற்படும். ஆகவே இந்தத் திருத்தம் தான் சரியானது,” என்றெல்லாம். இது சரியான வாதம் ஆகாது. நியாயமானதும் அல்ல. ஜனங்கள் தங்களுக்கு ஏற்படுகிற குறைபாடுகளையெல்லாம் அவ்வப்போது சட்டசபையின் மூலமாகத் தீர்த்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்றால், ஒவ்வொருவரையும் கண்காணிப்பில் வைத்துக்கொள்ளக்கூடிய வகையில் அவர்கள் பிரதிநிதிகள் அதிகம் இருக்கவேண்டும். மக்களுக்கும் அங்கத்தினர்களுக்கும் அதிகமாகத் தொடர்பு உள்ள் ஒரு நிலையை உண்டு பண்ணவேண்டும். அப்படிச் செய்ய விரும்பினால் வோட்டர்களின் எண்ணிக்கை மிகக் குறைவாக இருக்க வேண்டும். ஒரு தொகுதியில் லக்ஷக்கணக்கான வோட்டர்கள் இருந்தால் அந்தத் தொகுதி அங்கத்தினரால் எப்படி அவர்கள் எல்லோருடனும் தொடர்பு கொள்ள முடியுமென்று நான் கேட்க விரும்புகிறேன். ஆகவே பார்லிமெண்டில் அதிகமான பிரதிநிதிகள் செல்லக்கூடிய வகையில் சட்டத்தைத் திருத்தலாமே தவிர மிக அதிக பக்க ஜனங்களின் எண்ணிக்கையை எடுத்துவிட்டு தொகுதியின் விஸ்தீரணத்தை அதிகப் படுத்தும் திருத்தத்தை நாம் ஆதரிக்க முடியாது. அப்படிச் செய்வதற்கும் நமக்கு எந்த விதமான அதிகாரமும் கிடையாது. அவர்கள் அப்படிச் செய்திருப்பது குறித்து, அதை எதிர்த்து நமது வருத்தத்தைத் தெரிவித்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமே தவிர அவர்கள் ஒரு காரியத்தைச் செய்து விட்டார்கள் என்பதற்காக நல்லது பொல்லாதது எது என்பதை ஆராயாமல் அதை ஆதரிக்க முடியாது. யுத்த காலத்தில் மிகக் குறைந்த நபர்களைக் கொண்டு அரசாங்கத்தை நடத்திய காரணத்தாலோ, பிரிட்டிஷ் எகாதிபத்தியத்தின் காலத்தில் மிகக் குறைந்த பேர்கள் நிர்வாக சபையில்

9th March 1953] [Sri S. Ramalingam]

இருந்தார்கள் என்ற காரணத்தாலோ அவைகளெல்லாம் ஜனநாயகம் என்று சொல்லமுடியாது. அது உண்மையான ஜனநாயகமும் இல்லை. அதை மக்கள் சர்க்கார் என்றும் கூறமுடியாது. ஆகவே மக்கள் ஒவ்வொருவரின் பொறுப்பையும் ஏற்று இயங்குகின்ற பிரதிநிதிகள் அதிகம் பேர்கள் சட்ட மன்றத்தில் இருக்கவேண்டுமென்பதை யாரும் ஆசைப்பிக்க முடியாது. அங்கத்தினர்களின் எண்ணிக்கையை ஜனத்தொகை விகிதாசாரப்படி அதிக மாக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்வதற்கு நமக்கு உரிமையுண்டு. ஆகையினால் தான் அதிக அங்கத்தினர்கள் மக்கள் மன்றத்திற்கு வர முடியாத வகையில் மறைமுகமாகத் தடைசெய்யப் போகும் இந்தத் திருத்தச் சட்டத்தை ஆதரிக்கும் தீர்மானத்தை எதிர்ப்பதைத் தவிர எனக்கு வேறு வழி கிடையாது. அந்த முடிவுடன் தான் இந்தத் திருத்தத்தை எதிர்க்கிறேன்.”

* SRI G. NAGABHUSHANAM :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, 11-10
the comparison of India, made by the hon. the Leader of the a.m.
Opposition Sri Ramamurthi, with Great Britain, America and other democratic countries was not relevant, because it was like comparing a child to an adult man. India has been enjoying democratic Government only for the last seven years whereas Great Britain has been having a democratic Government for the last hundreds of years. Therefore, comparing Great Britain to India is beside the point. We must compare India to countries where similar conditions exist. Hence, I say the comparison made by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was odious. From that point of view he is criticising the present amendment before the House. He tried to show that the present amendment was undemocratic and said that it should not be ratified and added that we are not mere rubber stamps to ratify it. I am sorry for the language used by the hon. Member. We are not rubber stamps. We are enjoying democracy in India. We have got full freedom. Probably the hon. the Leader of the Opposition Sri Ramamurthi refers to other countries where there is no democracy and where there is only dictatorship. I submit India, as Mr. Bevan rightly pointed out, is the only country which has been doing everything in a democratic way. India at the inception has introduced adult franchise much earlier than any democratic country in the world did. Therefore, what I submit is that we must go slowly. Even if there is increase in population, are there not minors? So, increase of membership in the Legislature must be slow and steady. If there is increase in population, it does not mean that all the people that are born are voters. There are minors. The real reason why the amendment has been proposed is that there is an emergency and it has to be met. The arguments advanced by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition were beside the point and were not convincing. This amendment is proposed only to overcome a particular difficulty. That is to say, if there is a dissolution of the Parliament, we must be ready for that contingency and be able to carry on the elections. In these circumstances, the amendment made by Parliament is not only legal but also practical and realistic, and not undemocratic as pointed out by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition Sri Ramamurthi. The amendment is intended to meet an emergency. Therefore, I submit that we must ratify it.”

[9th March 1953]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, I would like to know whether the increase in population is an emergency or a permanent feature.” (Laughter.)

*** SRI T. SHANMUGHAM :—**“ கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நான் எதிர்க்கும் முறையில் இரண்டொரு வார்த்தைகள் சொல்லுகிறேன். ஜனத்தொகை அதிகமாக ஆக நமது பிரதிநிதித்துவமும் அதிகமாகத் தானே பெருகவேண்டும். ஜனத்தொகை அதிகமாவதால் அதற்குத் தகுந்தாற்போல் மெம்பர் தொகுதிக்கு ஜனத்தொகையை அதிகமாக்க வேண்டும் என்று நினைப்பது அவ்வளவு சரியல்ல என்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன். ஏதோ சென்ட்ரல் கவர்ன்மெண்டு செய்துவிட்டது இரண்டு பார்லிமெண்டும் செய்துவிட்டது ஆகவே நாம் அதை ஒப்புக்கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்று சொல்வது மிகவும் விசனிக்கத் தக்கது. நமக்குத் தோன்றிய நல்ல காரியத்தை நாம் செய்தே தீர வேண்டும். அவர்கள் பாஸ் செய்து விட்டார்கள் அப்படியே நாமும் செய்ய வேண்டும் என்று நினைக்கக்கூடாது. 500-க்கு மேல் 750 வரையில் போனாலும் பாதுகாமிலீலை. அதிகம் பேர்களுக்கு வசதி செய்து கொடுக்க வேண்டியது அவசியம் தான். அதிக ஜனத்தொகை இருந்தால் அதிகம் பேர்கள் அனுப்புவது சரியானது தான். இந்த சட்டசபையில் 200 பேர்கள் இருந்தார்கள், இப்பொழுது 375 மெம்பர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அதைப் போலவே தான் அங்கேயும் அதிகப்படியான மெம்பர்களை அனுப்புவது ஜனநாயகத்துக்கு உகந்த தாகும். இதே மாதிரியான தீர்மானம் ஒன்று திருவாங்கூர் கொச்சி சமஸ்தானத்தில் வந்து இந்த தீர்மானத்தை எந்த மந்திரி கொண்டு வந்தாரோ அவரே அந்த தீர்மானத்திற்கு எதிராக வோட்டு செய்தாக தெரிய வருகிறது. அப்படியே இந்த தீர்மானத்தை நாமும் நிராகரிக்க வேண்டும். ஜனநாயக ரீதியாக அதிகப்படியான மெம்பர்களை அனுப்ப வேண்டும் என்று தீர்மானிக்கவேண்டும். இதில் கட்சி வித்யாசம் ஒன்றுமில்லை. ஒழுங்கு முறை இதில் இல்லை. எல்லோரும் ஒன்று சேர்ந்து இந்த திருத்தத்தை ஆதரிக்க வேண்டும். மெம்பர்கள் அதிகமாவதால் அதிகமான சிலவு ஏற்படும் என்பதை மட்டும் மனதில் வைத்துக் கொள்ளக் கூடாது. இப்பொழுது Army-க்கு 200 கோடி ரூபாய் செலவாகிறது. இப்பேர்ப்பட்ட செலவையெல்லாம் குறைக்கலாம். ஜனநாயக சர்க்காருக்கு இவ்வளவு சிலவு வேண்டுமா என்பதைப் பார்க்க வேண்டும். நமது ராஜன் பாபு வந்தபோது ஒரே கூட்டமாக போலீஸ் ஆட்கள் இருந்தார்கள். இவ்வளவு பெரிய Police Army எதற்கு. அவரைச் சுற்றி எவ்வளவு பேர்கள் போலீஸ்காரர்கள் இருந்தார்கள் ஒரு ஜனநாயக President-க்கு இவ்வளவு போலீஸ்காரர்கள் எதற்கு. இவ்வளவு பேர்கள் சுற்றிலும் வேண்டுமா என்பதைப் பார்க்க வேண்டும். அதை பார்த்த போது ரொம்பவும் ஆச்சரியமாக இருந்தது. இப்பேர்ப்பட்ட செலவைக் குறைத்துக் கொள்ளலாம். நமது ஜனநாயக பார்லிமெண்டுக்கு அதிகப்படியான மெம்பர்களை அனுப்புவதுதான் சரியானது என்று நான் சொல்லிக் கொண்டு இந்த தீர்மானத்தை ஆட்சேபிக்கிறேன்.”

11-20
a.m.

*** SRI C. KANDASAMI :—**“ கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, அரசாங்கத் தரப்பிலிருந்து கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கும் இந்த தீர்மானத்தின் தன்மையை எதிர்க்கும் முறையில் சில வார்த்தைகளைச் சொல்ல ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். ஜனநாயக ரீதியில் அந்தந்த தொகுதியில் வோட்டர்களுடைய எண்ணிக்கை அதிகரிப்பதற்குத் தகுந்தாற்போல் இந்த தொகுதியின் மெம்பர்களின் எண்ணிக்கையை அமைக்கவேண்டும் என்பதற்காகவும் அப்படி அந்த மெம்பர்களுடைய எண்ணிக்கையை அதிகப்படுத்தாமல் அந்தத் தொகுதியின் ஜனத்தொகையை அதிகப்படுத்தாமல் நிர்ணயித்திருப்பதை எடுத்துவிட்டு ஜனத்தொகையை அதிகப்படுத்தலாம் என்று ஒரு திருத்தம் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இது அரசியல் சட்டத்தின் தலைகீழ் பாடமாக இருக்கிறது என்பதைதான் குறிப்பிடவிரும்புகிறேன். அதற்குத் தகுந்தாற்போல் தமிழில் ஒருபழமொழி உண்டு. அதாவது

9th March 1953] [Sri C. Kandasami]

தலைக்குத் தகுந்த குல்லாயா அல்லது குல்லாய்க்குத் தகுந்த தலையா என்று. அதைப் போல் இருக்கிறது இந்த திருத்தம். இன்றைக்கு உலகத்தில் நான்கு நாள் ஜனத்தொகை அதிகரித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறது. அவ்விதம் பெருகும் ஜனத்தொகையை குறைக்க வேண்டுமென்று கூச்சல் போடுகிறார்கள். ஜனத்தொகையை மட்டுப்படுத்த வேண்டும் என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். அந்த அளவிற்கு இது ஒரு பெரிய பிரச்சனையாக இருக்கிறது. மனிதன் தோன்றிய நாள் முதல் சில இடங்களில் கூட்டம் கூட்டமாக ஜனங்கள் இருந்தார்கள். சில இடங்களில் ஜனங்கள் இல்லை. அப்பொழுது ஜனநாயகம் இல்லை. அன்று பார்லமெண்ட் இல்லை. மனிதத்தன்மை வளர வளர பல பிரச்சனைகள் எழுந்திருக்கின்றன. பல பிரச்சனைகள் நான்கு நாள் மனிதன் முன்பாக வைக்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. அதற்குத் தகுந்தார்போல் ஏற்பாடுகள் செய்ய வேண்டும். ஜனத்தொகை அதிகரித்துக்கொண்டு போகும்போது சபையையும் அதிகரிக்கத்தான் வேண்டும். அந்தந்த தொகுதிக்குத் தக்கவாறு ஜனத்தொகை பெருகும் போது அதற்குத் தக்கவாறு பிரதிநிதிகள் ஏற்பட வேண்டும். அப்படி இல்லாமல் மெம்பர்களுக்குத் தக்கவாறு ஜனத்தொகையை நிர்ணயம் செய்ய வேண்டும் என்று சொல்வது ஜனநாயகத்திற்கு தலைகீழ் பாடமாக இருக்கிறது. இதை எல்லோரும் ஒத்துக்கொள்ள முடியாது. இது மட்டும் 5 லட்சத்திலிருந்து 7½ லட்சம் பேர்களுக்கு பிரதிநிதி இருக்கவேண்டும் என்று இருப்பதை கொஞ்சம் கவனித்து இன்னும் அதை 8½ லட்சம் என்று உயர்த்தினால் அந்த தொகுதியின் பிரதிநிதிகளுக்கு எவ்வளவு வேலை இருக்கின்றன என்பதையும் கவனிக்க வேண்டும். எந்த அளவு அந்த வேலை பாதிக்கும் என்பதையும் கவனிக்க வேண்டும். இப்பொழுது 7½ லட்சம் என்று இருக்கும்போது பிரதிநிதிகளுக்கு எவ்வளவு வேலை இருக்கிறது என்பதையும் கவனிக்க வேண்டும். ஜனத்தொகையை அதிகப்படுத்தினால் பிரதிநிதிகளால் எவ்வளவு பேர்களுடைய பிரச்சனைகளையும் எவ்விதம் கவனிக்க முடியும் என்பதை யோசிக்கவேண்டும். பஞ்சம், விவசாயம், வேலை கொடுப்பது, உணவு கொடுப்பது முதலிய பிரச்சனைகள் இருக்கின்றன. அவைகளை கவனிப்பதற்கு முடியுமா என்பதையும் பார்க்க வேண்டும். வா வா அந்தந்த தொகுதிகளின் வாக்காளர்களின் எண்ணிக்கையை உயர்த்திக்கொண்டு போவது ஜனநாயக முறைக்கு உகந்தது இல்லை என்று சொல்லவேண்டியதாக இருக்கிறது. இதை ஒப்புக்கொள்ள முடியாது. அதைத்தான் எல்லோரும் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளுவார்கள் என்று நினைக்கிறேன். மற்ற இடங்களைப் பார்க்கும்போதும் யுனெஸ்கோ ஸ்டேட்ஸ் ஆப் அமெரிக்காவிலும் அன்று 65 மெம்பர்கள் இருந்தார்கள். இன்றைய தினம் 400 அங்கத்தினர்கள் இருக்கின்றார்கள். அங்குள்ள ஜனத்தொகைக்குத் தகுந்தார் போல் சபையையும் விஸ்தரித்திருக்கிறார்கள். உலகத்திலுள்ள எல்லா தேசத்திலும் இந்த முறையைத்தான் கையாண்டு வருகிறார்கள். ஆனால் இங்கு விபரீதமாக இருக்கிறது. நம்முடைய ராஜ்யத்திற்கு ஜனநாயக ரீதியில் 75 ஸ்தானங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. இந்தத் திருத்தத்தின் காரணமாக அது குறைந்தாலும் குறையலாம். அந்தந்த தொகுதிகளின் ஜனத்தொகையையும் வாக்காளர்களையும் அடிப்படையாகக் கொண்டு அப்படி வைத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அதை பெருக்க கூடிய அவசியமும் ஏற்படும். குறையக் கூடிய அவசியமும் ஏற்படும். அப்பொழுது பிள்ளை பெறு இயக்கம் அவசியம் ஏற்பட்டாலும் ஏற்படும் என்பதுதான் என் அபிப்பிராயம். இதை கட்சி கண்ணோட்டத்துடன் பார்க்கக்கூடாது. ஆனால் ஒரு குறை சொல்லப் படுகிறது. ஆயிரம் பேர்கள் உட்காருவதற்கு கட்டடம் கட்ட முடியாது என்று. முப்பது கோடி ஜனங்களுடைய பிரதிநிதிகளுக்கு பத்தாயிரம் பேர்கள் இருந்தாலும் மக்கள் அதை கட்டி முடிப்பார்கள். இட வசதி இருக்காது என்று அரசாங்கத்தால் கூறப்படுகிறது. அது ஒப்புக்கொள்ளக் கூடிய கருத்திதான் அல்ல. இந்த மாதிரியான திருத்தத்தை பார்லமெண்ட் நிறைவேற்றியது வருந்தத்தக்க விஷயமாக இருக்கிறது என்பதை தெரிவித்துக் கொண்டு இந்த தீர்மானத்தை மனப்பூர்வமாக எதிர்க்கிறேன்.

* SRI S. RADHAKRISHNAN :—“ கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே இப்பொழுது கொண்டுவந்திருக்கும் பிரேரணை அரசியல் சட்டத்தில் 81-வது

[9th March 1953

'The Constituent Assembly which framed this Constitution was not a truly representative body and the Constitution was not made to properly meet the needs and desires of the Nation, which contains so many races, so many castes, and so many religions.'

ஆகையால் இந்த அரசியல் சட்டமானது நமது தேவைகளுக்கு ஏற்றவாறு அமையாமல் குறைகள் இருக்கிற காரணத்தினால் இப்பொழுது அடியோடு திருத்தவேண்டிய அவசியம் இருக்கிறது. அதாவது இப்பொழுது திருத்த வந்திருக்கிற வந்திருக்கிற பிரேரணை 81-வது ஷரத்து கிளாஸ் (clause) 1, சப்-கிளாஸ் (b) ஆகும். சப்-கிளாஸ் (a) என்று கூறப்படுவது உங்கத்தினர் எண்ணிக்கையை திட்டமாக கூறி இருக்கிறது. சப்-கிளாஸ் (b) ஜனத்தொண்டி விதிதாசாரத்திலிருந்து அந்த 500 எப்படி நிர்ணயிக்கலாம் என்று கூறி இருக்கிறது. 500 எண்ணிக்கையை மாற்றுவது என்றால் ஜனத்தொண்டி விதிதாசாரத்தை மாற்றியாகவேண்டும். ஜனத்தொண்டி விதிதாசாரம் அதிகப்படியாக இருக்கவேண்டுமானால், அங்கத்தினர்களின் எண்ணிக்கையை மாற்றியாகவேண்டும். இந்தப் பிரச்சனை இரண்டு கிளாசிலும் வந்து இருக்கிறது. எது எப்படி இருந்தாலும் அவர்கள் சொல்வதைப் பார்த்தால், ஏதாவது ஒன்றை மாற்றித்தொண்டிவேண்டும். 5 லக்ஷம் எண்ணிக்கைகூடாது என்றால் இந்த திருத்தத்தின் விவாதத்திற்கு காரணமேயில்லை. இந்த 500 எண்ணிக்கை ஏன் இருக்கவேண்டுமென்றால் பேரூது இடம் இடமே செலவு அதிகமாகிறது. இப்பொழுது இருக்கும் அங்கத்தினர்களுக்கு பேரூது சந்தர்ப்பம் கிடைப்பதில்லை. இன்னும் அங்கத்தினர்கள் அதிகரித்தால் பேசுவதற்கு நேரம் கிடைக்காது என்று சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் கூறுகிறார்கள். எதிர்க்கட்சிகாரர்கள் என்ன சொல்லுகிறார்கள் என்றால் ஜனங்களுடைய விதிதாசாரத்தை அதிகமாக்கிக்கொண்டே போகிறது. போடார்களின் எண்ணிக்கையும் 7 லக்ஷம், 8 லக்ஷம் என்று இருந்தால் ஜனங்களுடன் தொடர்பு கொள்வது கடினமாகும் என்று விவாதிக்கிறார்கள். இதுவரை பார்லமெண்டு அங்கத்தினர்களாக இருந்தவர்கள், இருப்பவர்கள் சாதாரணமாக ஏழைகளாக இருக்கமுடியாது. பார்லமெண்டு அங்கத்தினர்களாக இருக்கக் கூடியவர்கள் பணக்காரர்களாகத்தான் இருக்கமுடியும். ஜனத்தொண்டி ஏழு லக்ஷம் என்றாலும் சரி, 8 லக்ஷமானாலும் சரி, பத்து லக்ஷமாக இருந்தாலும் சரி இந்த பார்லமெண்டு தொகுதிக்கு பணக்காரர்கள்தான் இருக்கமுடியும். ஆகவே அடிப்படை மாறுதலையே செய்யலாம். ஜனத்தொண்டி அதிகரிப்பிற்கேற்ப மொத்த அங்கத்தினர்கள் தொண்டியை மாற்றுவதற்கு அரசியல் சட்டத்தை ஏன் மாற்றக்கூடாது? இந்த இரண்டு கிளாஸ்களைத் திருத்துவதற்காக ஷரத்து 81-ஐயே மாற்றி அமைத்தால் நல்ல என நான் கருதுகிறேன்.”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR:—“ചോദ്യക്കാരെ! ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ഇവിടെ അവതരിപ്പിച്ച പ്രമേയത്തെ ഞാൻ ശക്തിയായി എതിർക്കുന്നു. ഇന്നത്തെ നഷ്ടനഷ്ടം അനുസരിച്ചതുകൊണ്ട്, കഴിഞ്ഞ തിരഞ്ഞെടുപ്പുചെയ്യും അനുസരിച്ചതെന്ന ൧,൦൦൦ വോട്ടർമാർക്കാണ് ഒരു പ്രതിനിധി ഇന്നുള്ളത്. ഭരണഘടനയനുസരിച്ച് ൧,൦൦൦ വോട്ടർമാർക്ക് ഒരു പ്രതിനിധിയുമാവാം. അങ്ങിനെയാകുമ്പോൾ ഇന്നത്തെ വോട്ടു 37½ കോടിയായി വർദ്ധിക്കുമ്പോൾ ഏതായാലും വരാനാകാത്ത അപകടവും ഉണ്ടാകും. അങ്ങിനെയാകുമ്പോൾ പത്തു കൊല്ലത്തിനുള്ളിൽ വരുന്ന ടെൻഷൻ സിസ്റ്റം നിലനിൽക്കുന്ന ഒരു ഭരണത്തിന് അംഗീകരിക്കുന്നത് യുദ്ധവിനിയോഗത്തിനും വിവിധ വരണത്തിനും ജനപ്രതിനിധികളുടെ ആശയങ്ങളും അഭിപ്രായങ്ങളും

9th March 1953] [Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar]

എന്തായിരിക്കും എന്ന് മനസ്സിലാക്കുന്നത് ഭരണഘടനാപരമായ മാനദണ്ഡം വരുന്നത് വാസ്തവത്തിൽ അന്യഥമായിരിക്കും എന്നാണ് എനിക്ക് പറയുവാൻ ഉള്ളത്. അതേകാരണം കൊണ്ടുതന്നെ ഈ ഭേദഗതി ഗൃഹീകരിക്കുക അനവശ്യമാണ്.

പാർലിമെന്റിൽ അസംബ്ലികളിലും പ്രസിനിയികൾ വരുന്നത് അർത്ഥശൂന്യമായിരിക്കുമെന്നുള്ളതിൽ ജനങ്ങളുടെ അവഗണനയെ പറ്റി സംസാരിക്കുവാനും അവർ പരിഹാസം കാണുവാനും വേണ്ടിയാണ്. അപ്പോൾ പാർലിമെന്റിൽ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് അസംബ്ലികളിലും ചെന്ന് ഈ പ്രസിനിയികൾ ചോദനങ്ങളായ പ്രസ്താവങ്ങൾ ചെയ്യുവാൻ വേണ്ടിയല്ല. അപ്പോൾ അസംബ്ലിയുടെയും പാർലിമെന്ററുടെയും കാര്യങ്ങൾ കൂടുതൽ ഗൗരവം വരുന്നത് ഭംഗം വരുത്തും എന്ന് പറയുന്നത് ജനങ്ങളെ വഞ്ചിക്കുകയായിരിക്കും. ജനങ്ങളുടെ ആവശ്യങ്ങൾക്കും അവകാശങ്ങൾക്കും അനുരൂപമായ വിധത്തിൽ പ്രസിനിയികൾ കൊടുക്കുവാൻ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് വൈമനസ്സോ കാണിക്കുകയായിരിക്കും. ജനങ്ങൾ പെരുങ്കിഴ്ത്തി എന്ന് പറഞ്ഞ് പ്രസിനിയികളുടെ എണ്ണം കുറയ്ക്കാൻ വഴിയും ഇല്ലാതിരുന്നെങ്കിൽ വിഷമമില്ലാതെ തോട്ടത്തിൽ കിളിക്കാമെന്നു പറയുന്നതു പോലെയാണ് എന്നാണ് എനിക്ക് പറയുവാൻ ഉള്ളത്. ശ്രീമൻ ഗോപാൽ മേനോൻ പറയുകയുണ്ടായി ഇംഗ്ലണ്ടിൽ State Legislative കൾ ഇല്ല, കേന്ദ്രപാർലിമെന്ററുണ്ട്. അതുകൊണ്ടാണ് പാർലിമെന്റിൽ അവിടെ ഇത്ര അധികം പ്രസിനിയികൾ ഉള്ളതെന്ന്. എന്നാൽ ഞാൻ സവിനയം ചോദിക്കുന്നു. അമേരിക്കയിലെ സ്ഥിതി എന്താണ് എന്ന് നാരുററിപ്പുള്ളതെല്ലാം പ്രസിനിയികൾ ഉണ്ട്, 15,50,00,000 ആണ് അവിടെയുള്ള ജനങ്ങൾ. അവിടെ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് അസംബ്ലികൾ മാത്രമല്ല കേന്ദ്രപാർലിമെന്ററും ഉണ്ട്. പല കാര്യങ്ങളിലും അമേരിക്കയെ സ്ഥാനത്തും അസ്ഥാനത്തും ഉദ്ധരിച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന പല അംഗങ്ങളോടും എനിക്ക് ചോദിക്കുവാൻ ഉള്ളത് ഈ കാര്യത്തിൽ മാത്രം എന്താണ് നിങ്ങൾ നെരകയുത്സം അമേരിക്കയുടെ കാര്യത്തെ വിന്യസിക്കുന്നത് എന്ന്.

മറ്റൊരു വാദം നമ്മുടെ രാജ്യം വിദ്യാഭ്യാസപരമായും വ്യവസായികപരമായും പുറകോട്ട് നില്ക്കുന്ന ഒരു രാജ്യമാണ്, അതുകൊണ്ട് കൂടുതൽ പ്രസിനിയികളെ തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കുന്നത് ആവശ്യമാണെന്നാണ്. എന്നാൽ വിദ്യാഭ്യാസപരമായും വ്യവസായികപരമായും പുറകോട്ട് നില്ക്കുന്ന ഒരു രാജ്യമായതുകൊണ്ടുതന്നെയാണ് ഞാൻ പറയുന്നത് കൂടുതൽ പ്രസിനിയികൾ ആവശ്യമാണ് എന്ന്. അമേരിക്കയിലും ഇംഗ്ലണ്ടിലും മറ്റു അനേകം രാജ്യങ്ങളിലും റെഡിയോ മുഖേന വോട്ടർമാരോട് കാര്യങ്ങൾ പറയുവാൻ സാധിക്കും. അവിടെ ജനങ്ങളിൽ അധികവും പത്രം വായനക്കാരാണ്.

(At this stage Mr. Speaker occupied the Chair.)

അവിടെ പ്രസിനിയികൾക്കു ജനങ്ങളോട് കാര്യങ്ങൾ പറഞ്ഞ് മനസ്സിലാക്കുവാൻ ഉള്ള പലവിധ സൗകര്യങ്ങളുമുണ്ട്. അങ്ങിനെയുള്ള രാജ്യങ്ങളിൽ പ്രസിനിയികൾ കുറഞ്ഞാലും രസകേടുകൾ. എന്നാൽ എഴുതുവാനും വായിക്കുവാനും അറിയാത്ത കോടാനുകോടി ജനങ്ങൾ ഉള്ള നമ്മുടെ രാജ്യത്തിൽ കൂടുതൽ പ്രസിനിയികളെ തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് നാട്ടുകാരുടെ ആവശ്യങ്ങളും അവകാശങ്ങളും അസംബ്ലികളിലും പാർലിമെന്റിൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ശ്രദ്ധയിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരുവാൻ കഴിയും. മറ്റൊല്ലാത്തും ബാലിശങ്ങളായ വാദങ്ങളെയും ഉപേക്ഷിച്ച് ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ തള്ളിക്കളയണം എന്ന് ഞാൻ അഭ്യർത്ഥിക്കുന്നു. ഒരു സംഗതിക്കു പറയുവാൻ ഞാൻ ആഗ്രഹിക്കുന്നു. കമ്പട്ട് സ്റ്റേറ്റ് അസംബ്ലികൾ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ തള്ളിക്കളയുകയാണെങ്കിൽ ഈ ജനാധിപത്യവിരുദ്ധമായ നിയമം ഉണ്ടാകാൻ പോകുന്നില്ല. തിരു-കൊച്ചിയെ സംബന്ധിച്ചുടത്തോളം ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ അവിടുത്തെ മന്ത്രിമാർക്കു തള്ളിക്കളഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ളതാണ്. ആ നിലക്ക് എനിക്ക് അഭ്യർത്ഥിക്കാനുള്ളത് മന്ത്രിപ്രവരന്മാർ ഉൾപ്പെടെ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് കക്ഷിതന്നെ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ തള്ളിക്കളയണമെന്നാണ്.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, after having known the attitude taken by the party to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition belongs, in the House of the People, I am not surprised at the views expressed by that party here. The main objection to this amendment was put forward by the Leader of the Opposition on the ground that it was undemocratic. I con-

[Inside] [Sri C. Subramaniam] [2] [9th March 1953]

cede that his conception of democracy completely differs from our conception of democracy. Therefore I am not surprised when he levels a charge that this is an undemocratic measure. He cited the scales of representation in the various other countries and pleaded that there should be an increase in the number of Members in the House of the People. He said that in Ireland there was one representative for every 20,000. At that rate, if we were to calculate the number of Members which we should have in the House of the People, it would be an almost astronomical figure. He also said that in the United States of America, there were 435 representatives for 14 crores of people. On that scale also our representatives would number in thousands. Finally he quoted the example of the U.S.S.R. and said that the Supreme Soviet had 1,127 representatives for a population of 19 crores. I am not surprised at it. If there could be only one party and no other party could function, I very well understand that there can be not only 1,127 representatives, but even a little more than that. Because, in my view their Parliaments are nothing more than party conventions. On that scale, even our All-India National Congress has got more than 3,000 representatives participating in its annual convention. Therefore, there is no use of quoting the number of representatives in the Supreme Soviet, as no other party could function there and only one party can function and is functioning there. It is not a great thing for them to have 2,000 or 3,000 representatives as they can transact their business in a day or two. After all, we are furnishing our business in our Plenary session of the All-India Congress in two or three days, after considering a variety of subjects. If Parliaments are also required to function in the same manner, it would be possible to have increased number of representatives without any limit whatsoever. But our conception of Parliamentary debates and discussion and Parliamentary decisions is quite different. Here so many parties exist. Parties who are not prepared even to accept the Constitution and the very foundation of the Constitution and who want to scrap the entire Constitution are also entitled to stand for election and get elected, sit in the House and participate in the discussion. Thus, we have a number of parties functioning here. Under these circumstances, if we go on increasing the number of Members in Parliament, will it be conducive to the effective and efficient discussion and transaction of business in Parliament? We have to consider this point carefully. My own respectful submission is that when we have got to have effective and pointed discussion on the various matters, it is better to have a limited number of representatives in the Parliament. After all, 500 is not a small number. It may be asked, 'Well, what is the sanctity of any particular number?' Some number has to be fixed and so it has been fixed as 500. Beyond this, there is no sanctity about that figure. If we want to give representation on the scales prevailing in other countries, it will run into thousands. That is why we have fixed 500 as the maximum strength. It is a good number and we want to stick to it. That being so, we have to change clause (b). I do agree with some hon. Members that the framers of the Con-

9th March 1953] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

stitution, even though they have anticipated the progress and development in the country in ever so many other directions, did not anticipate the great progress which we have made in population. I do agree that is a mistake and that is why it has become necessary to change the provisions of the Constitution so soon within three years it was inaugurated and within one year of the first General Elections. But that does not alter the fact that the population has increased and in order to get over the difficulty clause (b) has got to be amended if we want to stick to 500 as the maximum number of representatives.

"I would like to bring to the notice of hon. Members one other factor. As it is, the scale prescribed is one Member for every 5 lakhs to 7.5 lakhs of the population. That is the limit fixed. After all, it is not going to make much difference if it is 750 thousand or 775 thousand. If some people contend that this very basis itself is wrong and the number of Members should run into thousands, it is a different thing. But when once we accept the Constitution and the scale prescribed under it, it does not make much difference whether it is 750 thousand or 775 thousand. In this connexion, I am glad the hon. Member Mr. Gopala Gounder made a very pertinent point. He said that as far as the area of a constituency is concerned, it does not alter. With regard to the contact that the Member has got to make with the people in the constituency, it does not make much difference. We have to bear that in mind.

"There is another factor. When we fix the number as 750 thousand or 850 thousand or whatever it is, some constituency or other will be affected. Suppose in a constituency by some chance there is an increase in population and the number exceeds 750,000 by about 100 or 1,000; then the Constitution is against it, and that constituency will have to be divided and a portion of it will have to be added on to another even though the increase may be small.

"The fixing of maximum leads to this difficulty, namely, that even for small unexpected increases in population, because of the provision in the Constitution, we will have to change the constituency itself. My own view is that as far as possible constituencies should be fixed. They should not be changed now and then to suit the convenience of this person or that person. Then alone a person will be able to work in that constituency and know who his voters are. So that fixity has got to be there. If there is a maximum prescribed, as soon as there is an increase in the population we have necessarily to make a thorough change in the constituency itself. On the whole, therefore, I am satisfied, and from the discussion here, I know, hon. Members here are also satisfied, with the present amendment. It is a reasonable one and we can safely accept it. In these circumstances, I respectfully beg of the hon. Members to accept this Motion unanimously."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah and Sri Vemiah are not in their places. Their amendments are, therefore, deemed to have been withdrawn. I shall now put the Motion to the vote of the House. The question is:

11-40
a.m.

[9th March 1953]

“That this House ratifies the amendment of Article 81 of the Constitution proposed to be made by the Constitution (Second Amendment) Bill, 1952, as passed by the two Houses of Parliament.”

The Motion was declared carried.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus.

Ayes 113.

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam. | Sri A. Ayyanar. |
| A. B. Shetty. | V. Muthu. |
| M. A. Manickavelu | R. Krishnaswami Naidu. |
| Naicker. | S. Jayarama Reddiar. |
| Dr. U. Krishna Rao | Vaikuntam. |
| Sri K. Rajaram. | G. Govindan. |
| B. Bakthavatsalu Naidu. | P. S. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar. |
| C. Rajam Ramaswami. | S. Ramasamy Naidu. |
| P. G. Karuthiruman. | Ar. A. Rm. Chockalingam Chettiar. |
| P. G. Manickam. | P. Chellathurai. |
| N. Mahalingam. | J. L. P. Roche Victoria. |
| R. Kuppaswami. | N. Rajagopal. |
| P. K. Thirumurthi. | T. K. Rama. |
| N. Mounaguruswamy Naidu. | T. V. Sannasi. |
| K. H. Bomman. | C. Muthiah Pillai. |
| M. K. Kempai Gounder. | P. Urkavalan. |
| M. P. Periaswami. | P. Selvaraj. |
| Ardhanareswara Gounder. | V. Arumugam. |
| A. Sambasivam. | A. Venktramiiah. |
| C. Lakshmana Kandar. | N. Chenchurama Naidu. |
| Dr. P. Varadarajulu Naidu. | K. Shanmughan. |
| The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan | R. B. V. Sudarsana Varma. |
| Nair. | P. Sathyarajayya Reddi. |
| Dr. R. Nagan Gouda. | Raja M. A. Muthiah Chettiar. |
| Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar. | Sri L. Lakshmana Das. |
| T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi. | P. Venkatasubbayya. |
| K. Koti Reddi. | S. Narayanappa. |
| O. Venkatasubba Reddi. | P. Ranga Reddi. |
| B. Parameswaran. | B. Krishnamurthy Rao. |
| V. K. Ramasamy Mudaliar. | K. Varadachari. |
| T. P. Elumalai. | D. Ramabrahmam. |
| S. Panchaksharam. | K. Adikesavalu Naidu. |
| H. M. Jagannatham. | M. Doraikannu. |
| A. Ramachandra Reddiar. | G. Nagabhushanam. |
| R. Thangavelu. | T. Anantha Pai. |
| R. A. Nataraja Mudaliar. | Y. Manjaya Shetty. |
| M. Kandasamy Padayachi. | K. Venkataramana Gowda. |
| V. Krishnaswami Padayachi. | N. N. Suvama. |
| G. Vagheesam Pillay. | E. K. Sankara Varma Raja. |
| A. S. Sahajanandam. | B. Vaikunta Baliga. |
| O. A. Nanjappa. | M. S. Mogral. |
| P. M. Munuswamy Gounder. | V. Chinnayya. |
| The Hon. Sri V. C. Palaniswami | M. Muni Reddi. |
| Gounder. | K. Appala Naidu. |
| D. Sanjeevayya. | K. Narayana. |
| Shanmuga Rajeswara | M. Srungaram. |
| Sethupathi (the Raja | M. Gangappa. |
| of Ramaswathapuram). | M. Pentannaidu. |
| S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama | V. Daramalinga Nayakar. |
| Rao. | N. C. Ramasamy Kandar. |
| Dr. T. S. Soundaram | Somasundara Gounder. |
| Ramachandran. | V. K. Kannan. |
| Sri M. S. Munisami Pillai. | W. J. Fernandez. |
| C. Chinnasami Naidu. | K. Uppi. |
| S. Shinnakaruppa Thevar. | M. Chadayan. |
| V. S. Sivaprakasam. | Kunhi Mohamed Shaffee. |

9th March 1953]

Ayes cont.

Sri K. M. Seethi.
„ G. Samja Koorayar.
„ V. Balakrishnan.
Raja Sagi Suryanarayana Raju.

Sri V. R. Nagarajan.
„ V. Gopala Gounder.
„ K. Aranganathan.
„ S. Radhakrishnan.

Noes

Sri M. Venkatasubba Reddi.
„ S. C. C. Anthony Pillai.
„ S. Pakkirisami Pillai.
„ O. Chengam Pillai.
„ M. Dharmalingam.
„ N. Sivarami Reddi.
„ D. Seetharamiah.
„ C. H. Kanaran.
„ K. Madhavan Nambiar.
„ R. Krishnan.
„ M. Hanumantha Rao.
„ P. Venkatasiviah.
„ P. Rama Rao.
„ M. Narayanasamy.
„ K. Venkajiah.
„ P. Syamasundara Rao.
„ B. Lakshminarasa Raju.
„ G. Satyanarayana.
„ G. Joseph.
„ K. Subba Reddi.
„ Chandra Ramalingayya.
„ G. Rama Rao.
„ K. Govinda Rao.
„ M. Veerabhadram.
„ K. Vinayakam.
„ Mookiah Thevar.
„ E. L. Raghava Mudaliar.
„ K. Krishna Rao.
„ A. Veloo.
„ Motaya Kudumbar.
„ D. Krishnamurthy Gounder.

Sri S. P. Thangavelu.
„ P. R. Rajagopala Gounder.
„ S. Kasi Reddi.
„ Saka Venkata Rao.
„ B. Sankaraya.
„ T. Nagi Reddi.
„ Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.
„ Bojja Appalasamy.
„ S. Vemiah.
„ N. V. L. Narasimha Rao.
„ N. Sivaraj.
„ G. Bapanayya.
„ S. Ramalingam.
„ K. C. Gopalan Unni.
„ P. Ramamurthi.
„ K. V. Ramaswamy.
„ T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
„ T. S. Ardhnari.
„ G. Yellamanda Reddi.
„ A. Govindasamy Nayagar.
„ P. Narasimha Reddi.
„ M. Kalyanasundaram.
„ K. T. Raju.
„ S. Vadiyelu.
„ M. Lakshmanaswami.
„ V. Madanagopal.
„ A. K. Subbiah.
„ K. P. Gopalan.
„ P. Jeevanandam.
„ C. Kandasamy.
„ P. K. Gopalakrishnan.

Ayes : 113.

Noes : 62.

Neutral : Nil.

The Motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The House will now adjourn and meet again at 8-30 a.m. tomorrow.”

The House then adjourned.

V.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

1. Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 4479, Home, dated the 15th December 1952, regarding exemption from payment of mofussil tax for State buses employed to carry delegates to International Conference of Social Work to Mahabalipuram [Laid on the table under section 11 (2) of the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931.]

2. Erratum to Home Department notification, dated the 20th August 1952.